arXiv:1603.03143v1 [gr-qc] 10 Mar 2016

# Gravitomagnetism and the significance of the curvature scalar invariants

L. Filipe Costa,[1,2,*] Lode Wylleman,[3,†] and José Natário[1,‡]

[1] *GAMGSD, Departamento de Matemática, Instituto Superior Técnico, 1049-001 Lisboa, Portugal*
[2] *Centro de Física do Porto — CFP, Departamento de Física e Astronomia, Universidade do Porto, 4169-007 Porto, Portugal*
[3] *Faculty of Applied Sciences TW16, Ghent University, Galglaan 2, 9000 Ghent, Belgium*

(Dated: March 11, 2016)

The curvature invariants have been subject of recent interest due to the debate concerning the notions of intrinsic/extrinsic frame-dragging, the use of the electromagnetic analogy in such classification, and the question of whether there is a fundamental difference between the gravitomagnetic field arising from the translational motion of the sources, detected with Lunar Laser Raging and in the observations of binary pulsars, and the gravitomagnetic field produced by the rotation of the Earth, detected in the LAGEOS Satellites data and by the Gravity Probe-B mission. In this work we clarify both the algebraic and physical meaning of the curvature invariants and their electromagnetic counterparts. The structure of the invariants of the astrophysical setups of interest is studied in detail, and its relationship with the gravitomagnetic effects is dissected. Finally, a new classification for intrinsic/extrinsic gravitomagnetism is put forth.

PACS numbers: 04.20.Cv, 04.25.Nx, 95.30.Sf, 03.50.De, 04.80.Cc.
Keywords: Gravitomagnetism, Frame-dragging, Chern-Pontryagin scalar, Electromagnetic Invariants, Electric / Magnetic Weyl tensor, Petrov Classification

**Contents**

**I. Introduction** 1
A. Notation and conventions 2

**II. Electromagnetic Scalar Invariants** 3
A. Observers measuring no magnetic/electric fields 3

**III. Gravitational scalar invariants** 5
A. Vacuum Riemann tensor 5
B. Observers measuring no gravitomagnetic (gravitoelectric) tidal tensors 7
C. General Riemann tensor 8
Vacuum with cosmological constant 9

**IV. Interpretation of the invariant structure of the relevant electromagnetic setups** 9
A. One single point charge 10
B. System of two point charges 11
Coplanar motion 11
C. Spinning spherical charge 12
D. Further examples — infinite rotating cylinder 13

**V. Interpretation of the invariant structure for the relevant gravitational setups** 14
A. One single point mass 16
B. Two bodies, coplanar motion — the Earth-Sun system 17
C. The gravitational field of a spinning body 19

**VI. Dynamical implications of the invariants. Gravitomagnetism.** 20
A. A magnetic dipole in the field of a spinning charge vs. a gyroscope in the Kerr spacetime 21
B. "Gravitoelectromagnetic fields" (GEM Fields) 22
1. post-Newtonian frames where $\vec{H}=0$ 23
2. Relation between GEM fields and tidal tensors 24
3. Uniform gravitomagnetic fields 24
C. What the invariants say about the GEM fields 25
D. New criteria for intrinsic/extrinsic gravitomagnetism 26

**VII. Conclusion** 29
Acknowledgments 30

**References** 30

## I. INTRODUCTION

In the last two and a half decades different experiments succeeded in measuring the so-called "gravitomagnetic (GM) field" — which can be described as the inertial force generated by mass/energy currents that is manifest in the precession of gyroscopes, or in the Coriolis-like (apparent) acceleration of a particle in geodesic motion relative to a frame fixed to the distant stars. One can cast (e.g. [1, 2]) the effects detected in two main types: rotational gravitomagnetism, arising from the rotation of a celestial body, and translational gravitomagnetism, originated by bodies in translational motion with respect to the reference frame.

*Electronic address: lfpocosta@math.ist.utl.pt
†Electronic address: lode.wylleman@ugent.be
‡Electronic address: jnatar@math.ist.utl.pt

Translational gravitomagnetism has been detected, to high precision, in a number of ways. The observations of the binary pulsar PSR 1913 +16 (namely the effect of the gravitomagnetic field caused by the motion of each star in the orbit of its companion) [3] form one example; other effects that can be cast as translational gravitomagnetism (cf. [4–9]) are the different measurements of the "geodetic" (or de Sitter) precession, namely the precession of the Earth-Moon system along its orbit around the Sun due to the gravitomagnetic field generated by the relative motion of the Sun, detected in the analysis of Lunar Laser Ranging (LLR) data [10–12]; the precession of the gyroscopes in the Gravity Probe-B [13] due to the translational motion of the Earth relative to the probe; and the precession of the pulsar's spin vector in the binary systems PSR J0737−3039A/B [14] and (with lower precision) PSR B1534+12 [15]. It has also been claimed [16–19] that the influence on the lunar orbit of the gravitomagnetic field generated by the translational motion of the Earth relative to the Sun has been detected via LLR.[1]

The gravitomagnetic field generated by the rotational motion of celestial bodies has been more elusive, due to its typically smaller magnitude. The only measurements performed to date concern the gravitomagnetic field arising from the Earth's rotation, detected in the analysis of the LAGEOS Satellites data [23, 24], and by the Gravity Probe-B mission [5, 13], with claimed accuracies of 10% and 19%, respectively. Its detection to a few percent accuracy is also the primary goal of the ongoing LARES mission [25].

The curvature invariants have been subject of interest in this context due to the ongoing debate concerning the notions of "intrinsic" vs. "frame-dependent" gravitomagnetism, and the question of whether there is a fundamental difference between the gravitomagnetic fields generated by the rotation and the translational motion of celestial bodies. The use of the curvature invariants in such discussion is motivated by an analogy with the quadratic invariants of the Faraday tensor: $\mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{F}$ and $\star\mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{F}$. In electromagnetism these invariants give conditions for the vanishing of the electric/magnetic fields for some observers; in particular, when $\star\mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{F}=0$ and $\mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{F}>0$, there are observers $u^\alpha$ measuring zero magnetic field $\mathbf{B}$. The latter is said to be "frame-dependent", and an example is the field produced by a uniformly moving (non-spinning) point charge. On the other hand, if $\star\mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{F}\neq 0$ or $\mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{F}\leq 0$, then $\mathbf{B}\neq 0$ for *all* observers; $\mathbf{B}$ is said to be "intrinsic", and an example is the field produced by a spinning charge. Based on the formal analogy with the quadratic curvature invariants $\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}$ and $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}$ (the Kretchmann and Chern-Pontryagin invariants, respectively), a similar classification was (somewhat naively) proposed in [1, 26] (see also [2, 27–30]) for the *gravitomagnetic field*: the non-vanishing or vanishing of $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}$ would signal the presence of intrinsic or frame-dependent gravitomagnetism, respectively. This scheme has then been used to imply a fundamental distinction between the "translational" gravitomagnetic fields mentioned above, and the gravitomagnetic field generated by Earth's rotational motion implied in [13, 23].

On the other hand, the scalar invariants of the Weyl tensor (which in vacuum becomes the Riemann tensor), have been studied in the context of a hitherto separate research field [36–41, 48, 67]. In particular, the invariant criteria for the classification of a vacuum Riemann tensor as purely electric/magnetic (such classification implying the existence of some observer for which its electric/magnetic part vanishes) are well established since the work by McIntosh *et al* [38] (see also [41]).

In the present contribution, we start by discussing the rigorous mathematical implications of the scalar invariants, closing the gap between these two research fields; we then study in detail and physically interpret the invariant structure of the astrophysical setups of interest, and, finally, dissect their actual implications on the motion of test particles, in particular the relation with the gravitomagnetic effects.

### A. Notation and conventions

1. We use the convention $G=c=1$, where $G$ is the gravitational constant and $c$ the speed of light, and the signature $(-+++)$; $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\sigma\gamma}\equiv\sqrt{-g}[\alpha\beta\gamma\delta]$ is the Levi-Civita tensor, with the orientation $[1230]=1$ (i.e., in flat spacetime, $\epsilon_{1230}=1$); $\epsilon_{ijk}\equiv\epsilon_{ijk0}$. Greek letters $\alpha$, $\beta$, $\gamma$, ... denote 4D spacetime indices, running 0-3; Roman letters $i,j,k,...$ denote spatial indices, running 1-3. The convention for the Riemann tensor is $R^\alpha{}_{\beta\mu\nu}=\Gamma^\alpha_{\beta\nu,\mu}-\Gamma^\alpha_{\beta\mu,\nu}+....$

2. *Tensors.* To refer to tensors (including 4-vectors) we use either a bold font symbol $\mathbf{T}$ or component notation $T^{\alpha\beta\gamma\cdots}$. $\mathbf{T}\cdot\mathbf{T}$ stands for the full contraction $T^{\alpha\beta\gamma\cdots}T_{\alpha\beta\gamma\ldots}$. Round (square) brackets around indices indicate (anti)symmetrization. $\star$ denotes the Hodge dual: $\star F_{\alpha\beta}\equiv\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}{}^{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu}/2$ for an antisymmetric tensor $F_{\alpha\beta}=F_{[\alpha\beta]}$, while $\star R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}\equiv\epsilon_{\alpha\beta}{}^{\mu\nu}R_{\mu\nu\gamma\delta}/2$ and $R\star_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}\equiv R_{\alpha\beta\mu\nu}\epsilon^{\mu\nu}{}_{\gamma\delta}/2$ are,

[1] There is however a debate concerning such claim, see [1, 18–21]. On the one hand, as argued in [16–19, 21], the constraints on the PPN parameters imposed by the measurements performed so far imply the gravitomagnetic interaction; and once both local Lorentz invariance and the Moon's orbit, as seen from the Earth, have been tested with sufficient accuracy, then in the Sun's rest frame one unavoidably needs to take into account the Earth's GM field to obtain the Moon's correct trajectory. On the other hand, in agreement with [1, 20], it is true that LLR cannot (since the stations are based on Earth) *directly* measure the Earth's translational gravitomagnetic field (which is zero in the Earth's rest frame). The only GM field that is being *directly* tested by LLR is in fact the one generated by the relative translation of the Sun, which is essentially [1] the one involved in the geodetic precession of the Earth-Moon system detected in [10–12].

respectively, the dual in the first and the second pair of indices for Riemann-like tensors $R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} = R_{[\alpha\beta]\gamma\delta} = R_{\alpha\beta[\gamma\delta]}$.

3. *Observers and reference frames.* Following [34, 59, 60, 73], an observer (of 4-velocity $\mathbf{u} \equiv u^\alpha$), denoted by $\mathcal{O}$ or $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$, is an entity endowed with a worldline in spacetime (tangent to $u^\alpha$), equipped with (besides other possible measurement devices) a clock and a system of axes to perform measurements. By reference frame ($\mathcal{S}$), over an extended spacetime region, we understand a 4-D basis (which could be orthonormal, or any coordinate basis) composed of a time-like plus 3 space-like vectors, continuously defined therein; it embodies a *congruence* of observers (whose worldlines are the integral lines of the time-axis).

4. *"Dyadic" notation.* Let $\mathbf{e}_i$ be an orthonormal basis in the rest space of $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$, $\mathbf{e}_{\hat{i}} \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0$. Following [49, 50], sometimes we shall denote the collection of space components $A_{\hat{i}\hat{j}}$ of a symmetric tensor $\mathbf{A}$ by $\overleftrightarrow{A}$; the following notation applies: $(\overleftrightarrow{A} \times \vec{v})_{\hat{k}\hat{l}} \equiv \epsilon^{\hat{i}\hat{j}}{}_{\hat{l}} A_{\hat{k}\hat{i}} v_{\hat{j}}$; $(\vec{v} \times \overleftrightarrow{A})_{\hat{k}\hat{l}} \equiv \epsilon^{\hat{i}\hat{j}}{}_{\hat{k}} v_{\hat{i}} A_{\hat{l}\hat{j}}$; $(\overleftrightarrow{A} \times \overleftrightarrow{B})_{\hat{i}} = \epsilon_{\hat{i}\hat{j}\hat{k}} A^{\hat{j}\hat{l}} B_{\hat{l}\hat{k}}$. (The hats are dropped in approximations where the distinction between coordinate and tetrad indices is immaterial.)

## II. ELECTROMAGNETIC SCALAR INVARIANTS

As a preparation for the gravitational case, we start by discussing the electromagnetic invariants and their physical meaning.

In terms of the Faraday tensor $\mathbf{F} \equiv F^{\alpha\beta}$, the electric and magnetic *4-vector* fields as measured by an observer $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$ of 4-velocity $u^\alpha$ are given by

$$E^\alpha \equiv F^\alpha{}_\beta u^\beta \ , \qquad B^\alpha \equiv \star F^\alpha{}_\beta u^\beta \ . \tag{1}$$

Both $E^\alpha$ and $B^\alpha$ are spatial with respect to $u^\alpha$ ($E^\alpha u_\alpha = B^\alpha u_\alpha = 0$) and thus have 3 independent components each, encoding the 6 independent components of $F^{\alpha\beta}$ and assembled in associated 3-vectors $\vec{E}$ and $\vec{B}$. The Faraday tensor and its Hodge dual decompose in terms of $E^\alpha$ and $B^\alpha$ as

$$F^{\alpha\beta} = 2u^{[\alpha} E^{\beta]} + \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} B_\gamma u_\delta \ , \tag{2}$$

$$\star F^{\alpha\beta} = 2u^{[\alpha} B^{\beta]} - \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} E_\gamma u_\delta \ . \tag{3}$$

The *electromagnetic scalar invariants* are the two real, independent relativistic Lorentz scalars that can be constructed from the Faraday tensor:

$$-\tfrac{1}{2}\mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{F} \equiv -\tfrac{1}{2} F^{\alpha\beta} F_{\alpha\beta} = E^\alpha E_\alpha - B^\alpha B_\alpha \ , \tag{4}$$

$$-\tfrac{1}{4} \star\mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{F} \equiv -\tfrac{1}{4} \star F^{\alpha\beta} F_{\alpha\beta} = E^\alpha B_\alpha \ . \tag{5}$$

The final expressions in (4)-(5), which read $\vec{E}^2 - \vec{B}^2$ and $\vec{E} \cdot \vec{B}$ in 3-vector notation, are thus independent of the observer $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$. In particular, if $\vec{E} \cdot \vec{B} = 0$ or $\vec{E}^2$ is larger, smaller, or equal to $\vec{B}^2$ for some observer, then this is true for every observer.

At each point the Faraday tensor can be completely classified in terms of its invariants, and one distinguishes the following cases [56, 72]:

**(i)** $\vec{E} \cdot \vec{B} \neq 0$ $[\Leftrightarrow \star\mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{F} \neq 0] \Rightarrow \vec{E}$ and $\vec{B}$ are both non-vanishing for all observers.

**(ii)** $\vec{E} \cdot \vec{B} = 0$ and $\vec{E}^2 - \vec{B}^2 > 0\,(< 0)$ $[\Leftrightarrow \star\mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{F} = 0,\ \mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{F} > 0\,(< 0)] \Rightarrow$ one can *always* find observers for which the magnetic field $\vec{B}$ (electric field $\vec{E}$) vanishes. The electromagnetic field is thus classified as *purely electric* (*purely magnetic*).

**(iii)** *null* case[2]: $\vec{E}\cdot\vec{B} = \vec{E}^2 - \vec{B}^2 = 0$ $[\Leftrightarrow \star\mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{F} = 0]$ $\Rightarrow$ either $\vec{E} = \vec{B} = 0$, or $\vec{E}$ and $\vec{B}$ are both non-vanishing for all observers.

The implications in **(i)** and **(iii)** are obvious. The proof of statement **(ii)**, as well as the explicit construction of the observers measuring no magnetic or electric field is given in the next subsection; one conclusion is however immediate: the condition $\vec{E}^2 - \vec{B}^2 > 0\,(< 0)$ implies the electric (magnetic) field to be non-zero for all observers, such that for a non-zero Faraday tensor there cannot, simultaneously, exist observers for which $\vec{B} = 0$ and observers for which $\vec{E} = 0$.

### A. Observers measuring no magnetic/electric fields

Consider two observers $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$ and $\mathcal{O}'(\mathbf{u}')$; their 4-velocities are related by

$$u'^\alpha = \gamma(u^\alpha + v^\alpha) \ ; \qquad \gamma \equiv -u^\alpha u'_\alpha = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - v^\alpha v_\alpha}} \ , \tag{6}$$

where $v^\alpha$ is a vector orthogonal to $u^\alpha$, $u^\alpha v_\alpha = 0$, interpreted as the spatial velocity of $\mathcal{O}'(\mathbf{u}')$ relative to $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$. In a locally *inertial* frame momentarily comoving with $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$ (where $u^i = 0$), $v^i = dx^i/dt$, yielding the ordinary 3-velocity of $\mathcal{O}'(\mathbf{u}')$.

By $(1, 2, 3)$ the electric and magnetic fields measured by $\mathcal{O}'(\mathbf{u}')$ are related to the ones measured by $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$ according to

$$E'^\alpha = \left[2E^{[\beta} u^{\alpha]} + \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} B_\gamma u_\delta\right] u'_\beta \ , \tag{7}$$

$$B'^\alpha = \left[2B^{[\beta} u^{\alpha]} - \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} E_\gamma u_\delta\right] u'_\beta \ . \tag{8}$$

[2] If the Faraday tensor is null in an open 4-D region, then the EM field there is a *pure radiation* field, see [56] p. 68.

To make contact with the textbooks on classical electromagnetism, consider, in flat spacetime, the inertial frames $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S}'$ momentarily comoving with the observers $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$ and $\mathcal{O}'(\mathbf{u}')$, respectively; in this special case one obtains the well known non-covariant expressions (e.g. Eqs. (11.149) of [32])

$$\vec{E}' = \gamma\left(\vec{E}+\vec{v}\times\vec{B}\right) - \frac{\gamma^2}{\gamma+1}\vec{v}\left(\vec{v}\cdot\vec{E}\right) , \qquad (9)$$

$$\vec{B}' = \gamma\left(\vec{B}-\vec{v}\times\vec{E}\right) - \frac{\gamma^2}{\gamma+1}\vec{v}\left(\vec{v}\cdot\vec{B}\right) , \qquad (10)$$

where $\vec{E}'$ and $\vec{B}'$ are space components of the electric and magnetic fields measured by $\mathcal{O}'(\mathbf{u}')$ *and expressed* in the coordinate system $\mathcal{S}'$ (the time components $E'^0$ and $B'^0$ are zero in $\mathcal{S}'$).

Let us now prove that observers exist for which $B'^\alpha = 0$ if, and only if, $\vec{E}\cdot\vec{B}=0$ and $\vec{E}^2 > \vec{B}^2$ (i.e., $\mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{F}<0$ and $\star\mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{F}=0$). From (8), the equation $B'^\alpha=0$ splits into two components, one parallel to $u^\alpha$: $u^\alpha B^\beta u'_\beta = 0$, i.e.,

$$B^\beta u'_\beta = B^\beta v_\beta = 0\,, \qquad (11)$$

plus one orthogonal to $u^\alpha$,

$$B^\alpha = -\frac{\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}u_\delta E_\gamma u'_\beta}{u^\mu u'_\mu} = \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}u_\delta E_\gamma v_\beta \ , \qquad (12)$$

which implies (11) on its turn. In the rest frame of $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$, and in 3-vector form, Eq. (12) reads

$$\vec{B} = \vec{v}\times\vec{E}\ . \qquad (13)$$

Hence, it is possible to find an observer for which $\vec{B}'$ vanishes if and only if (13) admits a solution $\vec{v}$. Since $|\vec{v}|<c=1$, this is the case if and only if $\vec{B}$ lies in the plane orthogonal to $\vec{E}$ and is contained within a circle of radius $|\vec{E}|$, which precisely means $\vec{E}\cdot\vec{B}=0$ and $\vec{E}^2>\vec{B}^2$. This concludes the proof.

To obtain the velocities of the observers for which $B'^\alpha=0$ (i.e, $\vec{B}'=0$), it is useful to decompose $v^\alpha$ into its projections parallel and orthogonal to $E^\alpha$,

$$v^\alpha_{\|E} = \frac{E_\beta v^\beta}{E_\nu E^\nu}E^\alpha\ ; \qquad v^\alpha_{\perp E} = v^\alpha - v^\alpha_{\|E}\ ,$$

and to recall the definition of the Poynting vector measured by $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$,

$$p^\alpha = \frac{1}{4\pi}\epsilon^\alpha{}_{\sigma\tau\beta}E^\sigma B^\tau u^\beta, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad \vec{p} = \frac{1}{4\pi}\vec{E}\times\vec{B}. \qquad (14)$$

Since $v^\alpha B_\alpha = 0$, cf. Eq. (11), $v^\alpha_{\perp E}$ is also the component of $v^\alpha$ parallel to $p^\alpha$: $v^\alpha_{\perp E} = v^\alpha_{\|p}$. As is clear from (13), $v^\alpha_{\|E}$ is arbitrary. Contracting (12) with $\epsilon^\lambda{}_{\sigma\alpha\tau}u^\tau E^\sigma$ (or, equivalently, taking the cross product of (13) with $\vec{E}$) we obtain[3]




Figure 1: Boosted observers that measure $\vec{B}'=0$. Their velocities $\vec{v}_i$ lie in the planes orthogonal to $\vec{B}$, and are such that their component orthogonal to $\vec{E}$ (that is, along the Poynting vector $\vec{p}$) is $\vec{v}_{\|p} = \vec{E}\times\vec{B}/\vec{E}^2$. The component $\vec{v}_{\|E}$ parallel to $\vec{E}$ is arbitrary.

$$v^\alpha_{\|p} = \frac{\epsilon^\alpha{}_{\sigma\tau\beta}E^\sigma B^\tau u^\beta}{E_\nu E^\nu}, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad \vec{v}_{\|p} = \frac{\vec{E}\times\vec{B}}{\vec{E}^2}\ , \qquad (15)$$

Therefore, the observers $\mathcal{O}'(\mathbf{u}')$ for which $\vec{B}'=0$ must move with a velocity that is orthogonal to the magnetic field $\vec{B}$ as measured by $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$, cf. Eq. (11), must have a component along the Poynting vector given by (15), and may have an arbitrary component $\vec{v}_{\|E}$ parallel to $\vec{E}$, see Fig. 1. In other words, the 4-velocities of these observers are those contained in the timelike plane spanned by $E^\alpha$ and the timelike vector

$$T^\alpha = u^\alpha + \frac{\epsilon^\alpha{}_{\sigma\tau\beta}E^\sigma B^\tau u^\beta}{E_\nu E^\nu} \qquad (16)$$

(with $T^\alpha T_\alpha = \vec{B}^2/\vec{E}^2 - 1 < 0$), i.e., those of the form

$$u'^\alpha = C\frac{T^\alpha}{\sqrt{-T^\alpha T_\alpha}} + D\frac{E^\alpha}{\sqrt{E^\alpha E_\alpha}}, \quad D^2 - C^2 = -1\ . \qquad (17)$$

Replacing $\{E^\alpha, B^\alpha\}\to\{B^\alpha, -E^\alpha\}$ in the above (compare (7) to (8)) one shows that the purely magnetic case ($\star\mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{F}=0$, $\mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{F}<0$) yields a class of observers measuring no magnetic field with 4-velocities given by analogues of (16), (17).

To end this section we still mention some additional properties to draw parallels and differences with the gravitational case below. A non-null Faraday tensor, i.e., $(\star\mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{F})\neq(0,0)$, has exactly two *principal null directions (PNDs)*, which are spanned by those null vectors

[3] This agrees with results known (in different contexts) in the literature: in Problem §25 of [72], *implicit* expressions are obtained for the velocity of the observers measuring aligned fields $\vec{E}'$ and $\vec{B}'$, or, equivalently, in Exercise 20.6 of [76], for which the Poynting vector vanishes; for a purely electric field, one can transform them into explicit expressions which match (15).




Figure 2: The time-like principal plane, spanned by the principal null directions ($k_1^\alpha$ and $k_2^\alpha$) of a purely electric Faraday tensor. The unit time-like vectors in this plane (and only those) are the 4-velocities of the observers measuring no magnetic field. This plane is also spanned by the timelike vector $T^\alpha$ and the electric field $E^\alpha$. The same diagram holds for the observers measuring no gravitomagnetic tidal tensor in vacuum Petrov type D spacetimes, by replacing $T^\alpha$ and $E^\alpha$ by the vectors $t^\alpha$ and $e^\alpha$ of Eqs. (39)-(40).

$k^\alpha$ that satisfy

$$k^{[\alpha}F^{\beta]}{}_\gamma k^\gamma = 0.$$

The PNDs generate the *timelike principal plane*. Observers $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$ with 4-velocity $u^\alpha$ lying in this plane are precisely those measuring a vanishing Poynting vector $p^\alpha$ (see e.g. [53]). For a purely electric (purely magnetic) Faraday tensor one has $E^\alpha B_\alpha = 0$, and by (14) the vanishing of $p^\alpha$ implies the vanishing of $B^\alpha$ ($E^\alpha$); hence the observers measuring no magnetic (electric) field are *those and only those* whose 4-velocity lies in the timelike principal plane. This is illustrated in Fig. 2.

## III. GRAVITATIONAL SCALAR INVARIANTS

Analogously to electromagnetism, the scalar invariants of the curvature tensor are related with the existence of observers for which its electric or magnetic parts vanish; but by contrast with electromagnetism, the invariants do not always yield sufficient conditions for that. We shall first focus on the vacuum case; relevant comments on the non-vacuum case are given at the end.

### A. Vacuum Riemann tensor

In the vacuum case, characterized by a vanishing Ricci tensor ($R^\gamma{}_{\alpha\gamma\beta} = 0$), the Riemann tensor $\mathbf{R} \equiv R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$ has 10 independent components in any frame, and exhibits the special property that the dual in the first pair of indices equals the dual in the second pair:

$$\star\,\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{R}\,\star \qquad (\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\epsilon\zeta}R_{\gamma\delta}{}^{\epsilon\zeta} = R_{\alpha\beta}{}^{\epsilon\zeta}\epsilon_{\gamma\delta\epsilon\zeta}). \tag{18}$$

Relative to an observer $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$, the *gravitoelectric and gravitomagnetic tidal tensors* [33, 34] (or "electric" and "magnetic" parts of the Riemann tensor, e.g. [87, 88]) are pointwise defined by

$$\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta} \equiv R_{\alpha\gamma\beta\delta}u^\gamma u^\delta\ , \qquad \mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta} \equiv \star R_{\alpha\gamma\beta\delta}u^\gamma u^\delta\ . \tag{19}$$

$\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$ are symmetric, tracefree, and spatial with respect to $\mathbf{u}$ ($\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta} = \mathbb{E}_{(\alpha\beta)}$, $\mathbb{E}^\alpha{}_\alpha = 0$, $\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta}u^\beta = 0$, and similarly for $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$), thus having 5 independent components each. In terms of $\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$ one has decompositions

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\alpha\beta}{}^{\gamma\delta} &= 4\left(2u_{[\alpha}u^{[\gamma} + \delta^{[\gamma}_{[\alpha}\right)\mathbb{E}_{\beta]}{}^{\delta]} \\ &+ 2\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\epsilon\zeta}\mathbb{H}^{\epsilon[\delta}u^{\gamma]}u^\zeta + 2\epsilon^{\gamma\delta\epsilon\zeta}\mathbb{H}_{\epsilon[\beta}u_{\alpha]}u_\zeta\ , \qquad (20) \\ \star R_{\alpha\beta}{}^{\gamma\delta} &= 4\left(2u_{[\alpha}u^{[\gamma} + \delta^{[\gamma}_{[\alpha}\right)\mathbb{H}_{\beta]}{}^{\delta]} \\ &- 2\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\epsilon\zeta}\mathbb{E}^{\epsilon[\delta}u^{\gamma]}u^\zeta - 2\epsilon^{\gamma\delta\epsilon\zeta}\mathbb{E}_{\epsilon[\beta}u_{\alpha]}u_\zeta\ , \qquad (21) \end{aligned}$$

which exhibit a certain analogy with (2)-(3).

In contrast to the Faraday tensor, a vacuum Riemann tensor has *four* real, independent invariants [101]: two quadratic invariants, namely the Kretchmann scalar $\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}$ and Chern-Pontryagin scalar $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}$, which in terms of the tidal tensors measured by an observer read

$$\tfrac{1}{8}\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} \equiv \tfrac{1}{8}R^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} = \mathbb{E}^{\alpha\beta}\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta} - \mathbb{H}^{\alpha\beta}\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}\ ; \tag{22}$$

$$\tfrac{1}{16}\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} \equiv \tfrac{1}{16}\star R^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} = \mathbb{E}^{\alpha\beta}\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}\ , \tag{23}$$

and are formally analogous to the electromagnetic invariants (4)-(5), but also two *cubic* invariants

$$\mathbb{A} \equiv -\tfrac{1}{16}R^{\alpha\beta}{}_{\lambda\mu}R^{\lambda\mu}{}_{\rho\sigma}R^{\rho\sigma}{}_{\alpha\beta} = \mathbb{E}^\alpha{}_\beta\mathbb{E}^\beta{}_\gamma\mathbb{E}^\gamma{}_\alpha - 3\mathbb{E}^\alpha{}_\beta\mathbb{H}^\beta{}_\gamma\mathbb{H}^\gamma{}_\alpha\ , \tag{24}$$

$$\mathbb{B} \equiv \tfrac{1}{16}R^{\alpha\beta}{}_{\lambda\mu}R^{\lambda\mu}{}_{\rho\sigma}\star R^{\rho\sigma}{}_{\alpha\beta} = \mathbb{H}^\alpha{}_\beta\mathbb{H}^\beta{}_\gamma\mathbb{H}^\gamma{}_\alpha - 3\mathbb{E}^\alpha{}_\beta\mathbb{E}^\beta{}_\gamma\mathbb{H}^\gamma{}_\alpha\ , \tag{25}$$

which have no electromagnetic counterpart. *At any point these four invariants may in principle take any value, independently of each other*, and are all needed to determine whether $R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$ has a purely electric/magnetic character. Analogously to a Faraday tensor, the Riemann tensor is called *purely electric (purely magnetic)* at a point if there exists an observer $\mathcal{O}'(\mathbf{u}')$ measuring a vanishing gravitomagnetic (gravitoelectric) tidal tensor: $\mathbb{H}'_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ ($\mathbb{E}'_{\alpha\beta} = 0$). The existence of such an observer clearly requires $\mathbb{B} = 0$ ($\mathbb{A} = 0$), besides $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} = 0$ and $\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} > 0$ ($< 0$), but this is not sufficient.

To explain why, it is useful to define the complex tensor

$$\mathbb{Q}^\alpha{}_\beta \ \equiv\ \mathbb{E}^\alpha{}_\beta - i\mathbb{H}^\alpha{}_\beta\ . \tag{26}$$

This is a tensor which is spatial relative to the observer, $u_\alpha\mathbb{Q}^\alpha{}_\beta = 0$, and consists of the sum of two symmetric spatial tensors, one real and one purely imaginary, *each of them* diagonalizable. Therefore, the existence of observers $\mathcal{O}'(\mathbf{u}')$ measuring $\mathbb{H}'_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ ($\mathbb{E}'_{\alpha\beta} = 0$) implies that the operator $\mathbb{Q}'^\alpha{}_\beta$ has two properties: it is diagonalizable and has real (purely imaginary) eigenvalues. Now, both properties are independent of the observer, i.e., they are

shared by the respective tensors $\mathbb{Q}^\alpha{}_\beta$ measured by *arbitrary* observers $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$. To indicate the origin of this fact, we note that $\mathbb{Q}^\alpha{}_\beta$ can be viewed as a linear operator in the complexified rest space of $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$. This is a 3D complex vector space isomorphic to the space of those complex anti-symmetric tensors $X_{\alpha\beta} = X_{[\alpha\beta]}$ satisfying $\star X_{\gamma\delta} = iX_{\gamma\delta}$ (so-called *self-dual bivectors*, see e.g. [46]); by virtue of (18) and $R^\gamma{}_{\alpha\gamma\beta} = 0$ the tensor $-\frac{1}{2}R_{\alpha\beta}{}^{\gamma\delta}$ acts as a trace-free linear operator on this space; moreover, all operators $\mathbb{Q}^\alpha{}_\beta$ are *equivalent* to this observer-independent operator (see (4.1)-(4.4) of [46], or [104]), meaning that not only they have the same eigenvalues $\lambda_k$ $(k = 1, 2, 3)$, i.e., the same characteristic polynomial

$$c(x) = x^3 - \frac{I}{2}x - \frac{J}{3} = (x - \lambda_1)(x - \lambda_2)(x - \lambda_3), \quad (27)$$

but also the same minimal polynomial $m(x)$, which in 3D fully determines the algebraic properties of operators.[4] Here $I$, $J$ are the complex invariants (e.g. [38, 41])

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \tfrac{1}{8}\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} - \tfrac{i}{8}\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} = \lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 + \lambda_3^2 \\ &= \mathbb{Q}^\alpha{}_\beta\mathbb{Q}^\beta{}_\alpha = \mathbb{E}^\alpha{}_\beta\mathbb{E}^\beta{}_\alpha - \mathbb{H}^\alpha{}_\beta\mathbb{H}^\beta{}_\alpha - 2i\mathbb{E}^\alpha{}_\beta\mathbb{H}^\beta{}_\alpha\ ; \qquad (28) \\ J &\equiv \mathbb{A} + i\mathbb{B} = -\tfrac{1}{16}R^{\alpha\beta}{}_{\lambda\mu}R^{\lambda\mu}{}_{\rho\sigma}(R^{\rho\sigma}{}_{\alpha\beta} - i\star R^{\rho\sigma}{}_{\alpha\beta}) \\ &= \lambda_1^3 + \lambda_2^3 + \lambda_3^3 = 3\lambda_1\lambda_2\lambda_3 = \mathbb{Q}^\alpha{}_\beta\mathbb{Q}^\beta{}_\gamma\mathbb{Q}^\gamma{}_\alpha \qquad (29) \\ &= \mathbb{E}^\alpha{}_\beta\mathbb{E}^\beta{}_\gamma\mathbb{E}^\gamma{}_\alpha + i\mathbb{H}^\alpha{}_\beta\mathbb{H}^\beta{}_\gamma\mathbb{H}^\gamma{}_\alpha - 3i\,\mathbb{E}^\alpha{}_\beta(\mathbb{E}^\beta{}_\gamma - i\mathbb{H}^\beta{}_\gamma)\mathbb{H}^\gamma{}_\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

One has $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda_3 = \mathbb{Q}^\alpha{}_\alpha = 0$, and the discriminant of the cubic polynomial $c(x)$ equals (up to a factor 2)

$$\Delta \equiv 2(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2(\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)^2(\lambda_3 - \lambda_1)^2 = I^3 - 6J^2. \quad (30)$$

The eigenvalue problem for $\mathbb{Q}^\alpha{}_\beta$ leads to the *Petrov classification*, which can be formulated as follows:

**(a)** Petrov type I: this is the generic case where all eigenvalues differ ($\Delta \neq 0$), and $m(x) = c(x)$.

**(b)** Petrov types D and II: both have $\Delta = 0 \neq IJ$, a double eigenvalue $\lambda = -J/I$ and a single eigenvalue $-2\lambda$, but $m(x) = (x + 2\lambda)(x - \lambda)^2 = c(x)$ for type II while $m(x) = (x+2\lambda)(x-\lambda)$ for type D; in terms of $\mathbb{Q}^\alpha{}_\beta$ this means that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(\mathbb{Q})^\alpha{}_\beta &\equiv (\mathbb{Q}^\alpha{}_\gamma + 2\lambda h^\alpha{}_\gamma)(\mathbb{Q}^\gamma{}_\beta - \lambda h^\gamma{}_\beta) = 0\ , \\ h^\alpha_\beta &\equiv \delta^\alpha_\beta + u^\alpha u_\beta, \qquad \lambda \equiv -\frac{J}{I} \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

holds for type D, while $\mathcal{F}(\mathbb{Q})^\alpha{}_\beta \neq 0$ for type II.

**(c)** Petrov types N, III and O: all have $I = J = \Delta = 0$ and a triple eigenvalue 0, but the respective minimal polynomials are $m(x) = x^3 = c(x)$, $x^2$ and $x$ (such that type O corresponds to $\mathbf{R} = 0$).

Referring to footnote 4, diagonalizability of the operators $\mathbb{Q}^\alpha{}_\beta$ (in respective bases of eigenvectors) precisely means that the Petrov type is I or D or trivial type O (corresponding to $\mathbf{R} = 0$ and $\mathbb{Q}^\alpha{}_\beta = 0$ for all $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$). In particular, the characteristic property (31) for type D ensures diagonalizability of $\mathbb{Q}^\alpha{}_\beta$ and distinguishes this type from the non-diagonal Petrov type II, *a distinction that cannot be made in terms of invariants* (which may be equal for both types). From the discussion above it follows that a non-zero vacuum Riemann tensor that is purely electric (purely magnetic) is of Petrov type I or D and the operators $\mathbb{Q}^\alpha{}_\beta$ have real (purely imaginary) eigenvalues. Now, it turns out that these are not only *necessary*, but also *sufficient* conditions for the existence of observers measuring a vanishing magnetic (electric) tidal tensor: it is a well known property of Petrov types I and D (see e.g. [46, 102, 104, 108]) that observers $\mathcal{O}'(\mathbf{u}')$ always exist for which the operator $\mathbb{Q}'^\alpha{}_\beta$ allows for a basis of *real orthonormal* eigenvectors;[5] in the case that the eigenvalues $\lambda_k$ are all real (purely imaginary), it follows from the primed version of (26) that such an observer $\mathcal{O}'(\mathbf{u}')$ measures $\mathbb{H}'_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ ($\mathbb{E}'_{\alpha\beta} = 0$). Hence we can say that *a non-zero vacuum Riemann tensor is purely electric (purely magnetic) if and only if its Petrov type is I or D and the eigenvalues $\lambda_k$ of the $\mathbb{Q}^\alpha{}_\beta$ operators are real (purely imaginary)*. Furthermore, all eigenvalues being real (purely imaginary) is equivalent to[6]

$$I > 0\ (< 0)\ \text{real}, \quad J\ \text{real (imaginary)}, \quad \Delta \geq 0\ (\leq 0)\ \text{real}. \quad (32)$$

which on its turn is easily seen to be equivalent to $I > 0$ $(< 0)$ and either $J = 0$ or $\mathbb{M} \geq 0$ real, where for $J \neq 0$ one defines the dimensionless invariant $\mathbb{M}$ by [99]

$$\mathbb{M} \equiv \frac{\Delta}{J^2} = \frac{I^3}{J^2} - 6\ . \quad (33)$$

Since, given $I \neq 0$, $J = 0$ and $\mathbb{M} > 0$ automatically give Petrov type I ($\Delta \neq 0$) while Petrov type D is fully

[4] Recall that the minimal polynomial $m(x)$ of a linear operator $L$ on a vector space is the polynomial $p(x)$ of least degree and leading coefficient 1 for which $p(L) = 0$; *all* eigenvalues (roots of $c(x)$) *and only those* are roots of $m(x)$, but possibly occur with lower multiplicities in $m(x)$ than in $c(x)$; $L$ is diagonalizable precisely if the multiplicities in $m(x)$ are 1 for all eigenvalues.

[5] By (26) this means that the tensors $\mathbb{E}'^\alpha{}_\beta$ and $\mathbb{H}'^\alpha{}_\beta$ measured by these observers are simultaneously diagonalizable and commuting (since they are symmetric), which is equivalent to saying that the "super-Poynting vector" $\mathcal{P}'^\alpha$ in Eq. (44) vanishes for them.

[6] That real (purely imaginary) eigenvalues imply (32) follows immediately from (28)-(29) and the first expression for $\Delta$ in (30). Conversely, a cubic polynomial $p(x)$ with real coefficients and vanishing quadratic term has roots $-2a$ and $a \pm b$, with $a$ real and $b$ either real or purely imaginary, and discriminant $D = 2b^2(9a^2 - b^2)^2$ (cf. (30)); hence $D \geq 0$ implies $b$ real and all roots are real; given (32) one applies this to $p(x) = c(x)$, with roots $\lambda_k$ and $D = \Delta$ ($p(x) = ic(ix)$, with roots $-i\lambda_k$ and $D = -\Delta$) to see that the $\lambda_k$'s are all real (purely imaginary). Compare to the more intricate reasoning in [38, 99].

characterized by property (31) (the trace of which gives back $\Delta = \mathbb{M} = 0$), we conclude that *a non-zero vacuum Riemann tensor is purely electric (purely magnetic), i.e., an observer exists for which $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$ ($\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta}$) vanishes, if and only if the following two conditions hold* (cf. [38, 103]):

$$I > 0\,(<0)\,\text{real}, \tag{34}$$

$$J = 0 \;\; or \;\; \{J \neq 0 \text{ and } \mathbb{M} > 0\,\text{real}\} \;\; or \;\; (31)\;. \tag{35}$$

On using (28)-(31) and (33) this criterion can be easily tested by calculating $\mathbb{Q}^{\alpha}{}_{\beta}$ relative to *any* observer $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$. Notice that the invariants are sufficient to formulate the purely electric or magnetic conditions in the Petrov type I case $\Delta \neq 0$, but not when $\Delta = 0 \neq IJ$ where condition (31) is needed to discriminate (allowed) Petrov type D from (forbidden) Petrov type II.

It follows that one can make formally similar statements to **(i)**-**(iii)** of the electromagnetic case in Sec. II, replacing $\mathbf{F}$ by $\mathbf{R}$ and adding the condition (35) to **(ii)**:

- **(i)** $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} \neq 0\,[\Leftrightarrow \mathbb{E}^{\alpha\beta}\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta} \neq 0] \Rightarrow \mathbb{E}_{\alpha\gamma}$ and $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\gamma}$ are both non-vanishing for all observers.
- **(ii)** $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} = 0$, $\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} > 0\,(<0)$ *and* (35) $\Rightarrow$ one can *always* find an observer for which $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\gamma}$ ($\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\gamma}$) vanishes. These are the so-called purely electric (magnetic) vacuum spacetimes.
- **(iii)** All invariants vanish: $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} = J = 0 \Rightarrow$ either $\mathbf{R} = 0$ (type O flat spacetime) or the Petrov type is III or N and $\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\gamma}$, $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\gamma} \neq 0$ for all observers[7].

The implications in **(i)** and **(iii)** are obvious. Spacetimes obeying **(i)** are either of Petrov types I, II, or D, while **(ii)** implies Petrov type I or D as explained above. Notice that **(ii)** implies as well that $\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta}$ ($\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$) is non-zero for all observers; in particular, for a (non-zero) vacuum Riemann tensor at a point, there cannot, simultaneously, exist observers for which $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ and observers for which $\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta} = 0$, as is also clear from the real (purely imaginary) character of corresponding $\mathbb{Q}^{\alpha}{}_{\beta}$-eigenvalues.

The possibilities lying outside criteria **(i)**-**(iii)** have no counterpart in the formal analogy with electromagnetism. That is the case $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} = 0$ with $\mathbb{M} < 0$ real or $\mathbb{M}$ complex (which are of type I), where it is not possible to find an observer for which $\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta}$ (or $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$) is zero. Examples of vacuum solutions of this kind are the Lewis metrics for the Lewis class [57] (or, equivalently, the Van Stockum exterior solution for $aR > 1/2$, see [37]), describing a special class of the exterior metrics produced by infinite rotating cylinders. As for the case $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} = 0$ with $J \neq 0$ (implying $\mathbb{M} = -6$) no examples of spacetime regions where this holds are known.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that no vacuum solutions are known for which the Riemann tensor is purely magnetic (i.e., observers exist for which $\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta} = 0$) *in a open 4-D region*, and it has therefore been conjectured that no such solutions exist (see e.g. [45]).[8] However, a vacuum Riemann tensor can be purely magnetic in 3D hypersurfaces (exemplified in Fig. 7) or lower dimensional sets.

### B. Observers measuring no gravitomagnetic (gravitoelectric) tidal tensors

As explained above, the existence of observers for which the gravitomagnetic (gravitoelectric) tidal tensor vanishes at a point of a non-flat vacuum spacetime requires the Petrov type to be either I or D. Their appearances for both Petrov types are well-known [36, 103, 104, 108]. In the Petrov type I case there is a unique such observer. A vacuum Riemann tensor of type D, on the other hand, shows strong analogy with a Faraday tensor: it has exactly two *principal null directions (PNDs)* which are spanned by those null vectors $k^{\alpha}$ that satisfy

$$k^{[\alpha}R^{\beta]}{}_{\gamma\delta\epsilon}k^{\gamma}k^{\epsilon} = 0\;; \tag{36}$$

these null vectors generate the *timelike principal plane*, and analogously to the situation in electromagnetism, the observers measuring no $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$ ($\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta}$) are precisely those with a 4-velocity in this plane, see Fig. 2.

As proved in general in the companion paper [104], the following algorithm, specified to the purely electric (purely magnetic) case, gives the 4-velocity of the observers $\mathcal{O}'(\mathbf{u}')$ for which $\mathbb{H}'_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ ($\mathbb{E}'_{\alpha\beta} = 0$) in terms of the tidal tensors measured by an arbitrary observer $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$:

1. For each non-degenerate eigenvalue $\lambda_k$ of $\mathbb{Q}^{\alpha}{}_{\beta}$ construct a vector $v_k^{\alpha}$ in the corresponding eigenspace (take $k = 1$ for type D and $k = 1, 2, 3$ for type I), by picking any spatial vector $x^{\alpha}$ in the rest space of the observer $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$ such that

$$\text{type D:}\;\; v_1^{\alpha} \equiv \mathbb{Q}^{\alpha}{}_{\beta}x^{\beta} - \lambda x^{\alpha} \neq 0, \quad \lambda \equiv -J/I\;; \tag{37}$$

$$\text{type I:}\;\; v_k^{\alpha} \equiv \mathbb{Q}^{\alpha}{}_{\gamma}\mathbb{Q}^{\gamma}{}_{\beta}x_k^{\beta} + \lambda_k\mathbb{Q}^{\alpha}{}_{\beta}x^{\beta} + (\lambda_k^2 - \tfrac{1}{2}I)x_k^{\alpha} \neq 0,$$

$$\lambda_k = \alpha\sqrt{\frac{2|I|}{3}}\cos\left(\frac{\arccos L_{\alpha}}{3} - k\frac{2\pi}{3}\right), \quad k = 1, 2, 3,$$

$$L_{\alpha} \equiv \frac{\text{sgn}(\alpha J)}{\sqrt{1 + \mathbb{M}/6}}, \quad \alpha = \begin{cases} 1, & \mathbb{H}'_{\alpha\beta} = 0, \\ i, & \mathbb{E}'_{\alpha\beta} = 0. \end{cases} \tag{38}$$

[7] In direct analogy with electromagnetism (see footnote 2), the vanishing of all invariants has been proposed as a criterion (Bel's second criterion) for "pure" gravitational radiation, see [47] and also [48] p. 53. Such criterion is based on "super-energy" [34, 36, 51–53, 68].

[8] The conjecture has been proven for Petrov type D [106] and for type I with $J = 0$ [107]; it has further been shown that, in any vacuum spacetime, $\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta} \neq 0$ with respect to *any* observer congruence that is either shear-free [44], non-rotating [42] or geodesic [43]; see [41] for a complete survey.

2. The complex vectors $v_k^\alpha$ are orthogonal to $u^\alpha$, non-null, and mutually orthogonal in the type I case; normalize them to unit vectors $v_k^\alpha/\sqrt{v_k^\alpha (v_k)_\alpha} \equiv e_k^\alpha - i\, b_k^\alpha$, such that $e_k^\alpha (b_l)_\alpha = 0$ and $e_k^\alpha (e_l)_\alpha - b_k^\alpha (b_l)_\alpha = \delta_{kl}$.

3. In the type D case, the observers measuring no $\mathbb{H}'_{\alpha\beta}$ ($\mathbb{E}'_{\alpha\beta}$) are those with 4-velocity of the form

$$u'^\alpha = C\frac{t^\alpha}{\sqrt{-t^\alpha t_\alpha}} + D\frac{e^\alpha}{\sqrt{e^\alpha e_\alpha}}, \quad D^2 - C^2 = -1, \tag{39}$$

$$t^\alpha \equiv u^\alpha + \frac{\epsilon^\alpha{}_{\sigma\tau\beta} e^\sigma b^\tau u^\beta}{e_\nu e^\nu}. \tag{40}$$

In the type I case the unique observer lies along the timelike direction spanned by the vector

$$\left(\sum_{k=1}^{3} e_k^\beta (e_k)_\beta - 1\right) u^\alpha + \eta^\alpha{}_{\beta\gamma\delta} u^\delta \sum_{k=1}^{3} e_k^\beta b_k^\gamma \ . \tag{41}$$

Notice that (39)-(40) is formally analogous to the electromagnetic expressions (16)-(17) which yield the 4-velocities of the observers for which the magnetic field vanishes in the purely electric case. An alternative expression for $t^\alpha$ is [104]

$$t^\alpha = u^\alpha + \frac{2\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}\mathbb{E}_{\beta\mu}\mathbb{H}^\mu{}_\gamma u_\delta}{9|\lambda|^2 A(A+1)} \ ; \tag{42}$$

$$A \equiv \sqrt{1 + \frac{2}{3}\left(\frac{\mathbb{E}^{\alpha\beta}\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta} + \mathbb{H}^{\alpha\beta}\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}}{6|\lambda|^2} - 1\right)} \ , \tag{43}$$

where we recognize the "super-Poynting" vector (see e.g. [34, 36, 51–53, 68], and compare to (14))

$$\mathcal{P}^\alpha \equiv \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}\mathbb{E}_{\beta\mu}\mathbb{H}^\mu{}_\gamma u_\delta, \quad \text{or} \quad \vec{\mathcal{P}} \equiv \overleftrightarrow{\mathbb{E}} \times \overleftrightarrow{\mathbb{H}} \ , \tag{44}$$

the second expression holding in dyadic notation and in the rest frame of $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$. Therefore, the observers $\mathcal{O}'(\mathbf{u}')$ for which $\mathbb{H}'_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ ($\mathbb{E}'_{\alpha\beta} = 0$) must move, relative to $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$, with a velocity $v^\alpha$ that has a component parallel to $\mathcal{P}^\alpha$ given by

$$v^\alpha_{\parallel\mathcal{P}} = \frac{2\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}\mathbb{E}_{\beta\mu}\mathbb{H}^\mu{}_\gamma u_\delta}{9|\lambda|^2 A(A+1)}; \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad \vec{v}_{\parallel\mathcal{P}} = \frac{2\overleftrightarrow{\mathbb{E}} \times \overleftrightarrow{\mathbb{H}}}{9|\lambda|^2 A(A+1)}, \tag{45}$$

and may have an arbitrary component parallel to $e^\alpha$, see Fig 3. Notice the analogy with the electromagnetic counterparts, Eqs. (15)-(16), and Fig. 1; and also the difference: whereas Eqs. (42)-(45) take the same form for observers measuring no $\mathbb{H}'_{\alpha\beta}$ or $\mathbb{E}'_{\alpha\beta}$ (in purely electric or purely magnetic spacetimes, respectively), Eqs. (15)-(16) hold only for the observers measuring $B^\alpha = 0$ (in purely electric fields); in order to obtain the velocity of the observers measuring $E^\alpha = 0$ (in purely magnetic fields), one needs to replace $E^\nu E_\nu$ by $B^\nu B_\nu$ in the denominators, and switch $\vec{E}$ and $\vec{B}$ in Fig. 1.




Figure 3: Boosted observers that measure $\mathbb{H}'_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ ($\mathbb{E}'_{\alpha\beta} = 0$) in Petrov type D spacetimes. Their velocities $\vec{v}_i$ have a component parallel to the super-Poynting vector $\vec{\mathcal{P}}$ given by Eq. (45), and an arbitrary component parallel to the vector $\vec{e}$ defined in point 2. Notice the analogy with Fig. 1.

### C. General Riemann tensor

In the presence of sources, the Riemann tensor does not obey (18). Generically it has 20 independent components in any frame, and relative to an arbitrary observer $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$ it may be completely characterized by the three spatial tensors [105]

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta} \equiv R_{\alpha\mu\beta\nu}u^\mu u^\nu \ , \qquad \mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta} \equiv \star R_{\alpha\mu\beta\nu}u^\mu u^\nu \ , \\ &\mathbb{F}_{\alpha\beta} \equiv \star R\star_{\alpha\mu\beta\nu}\, u^\mu u^\nu \ , \end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

according to the formula [34, 52]

$$\begin{aligned} R^{\alpha\beta}{}_{\gamma\delta} \ = \ & 4\mathbb{E}^{[\alpha}{}_{[\gamma}u_{\delta]}u^{\beta]} + \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\phi\psi}u_\psi\epsilon^{\mu\nu}{}_{\gamma\delta}u_\nu\mathbb{F}_{\phi\mu} \\ & +2\left\{\epsilon^{\mu\chi}{}_{\gamma\delta}u_\chi\mathbb{H}_\mu{}^{[\beta}u^{\alpha]} + \epsilon^{\mu\alpha\beta\chi}u_\chi\mathbb{H}_{\mu[\delta}u_{\gamma]}\right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

The tensors $\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\mathbb{F}_{\alpha\beta}$ are symmetric and spatial relative to $u^\alpha$, thus having 6 independent components each; $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$ is spatial and traceless, possessing 8 independent components. $\mathbb{F}_{\alpha\beta}$ has no electromagnetic analogue.

From the Riemann tensor one can generically construct 14 independent scalar invariants [46, 48]. In particular, the Kretchmann and Chern-Pontryagin scalars are given in terms of the tensors (46) by

$$\frac{1}{4}\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} = \mathbb{E}^{\alpha\gamma}\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\gamma} + \mathbb{F}^{\alpha\gamma}\mathbb{F}_{\alpha\gamma} - 2\mathbb{H}^{\alpha\gamma}\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\gamma} \ , \tag{48}$$

$$\frac{1}{8}\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} = \mathbb{E}^{\alpha\gamma}\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\gamma} - \mathbb{F}^{\alpha\gamma}\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\gamma} \ , \tag{49}$$

The Riemann tensor may be decomposed as follows:

$$R^{\alpha\beta}{}_{\gamma\delta} = C^{\alpha\beta}{}_{\gamma\delta} + 2\delta^{[\alpha}_{[\gamma}R^{\beta]}{}_{\delta]} - \frac{1}{3}R\,\delta^{\alpha}_{[\gamma}\delta^{\beta}_{\delta]} \tag{50}$$

Here $R_{\alpha\beta} \equiv R^\gamma{}_{\alpha\gamma\beta}$ is the Ricci tensor, $R \equiv R^\alpha{}_\alpha$ the Ricci scalar, and $\mathbf{C} \equiv C_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$ the *Weyl tensor*, which has the same symmetries as the Riemann tensor, obeys (18) with $\mathbf{R}$ replaced by $\mathbf{C}$, and is moreover trace-free: $C^\gamma{}_{\alpha\gamma\beta} = 0$. One defines the electric and magnetic parts of the Weyl tensor relative to an observer $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$ by

$$\mathcal{E}_{\alpha\beta} \equiv C_{\alpha\gamma\beta\delta}u^\gamma u^\delta; \qquad \mathcal{H}_{\alpha\beta} \equiv \star C_{\alpha\gamma\beta\delta}u^\gamma u^\delta \ . \tag{51}$$

By (50) the relation with the tensors (46) is

$$\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta} = \mathcal{E}_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{R}{6}\left[g_{\alpha\beta} + u_\alpha u_\beta\right] + \frac{1}{2}\left[g_{\alpha\beta}R_{\gamma\delta}u^\gamma u^\delta - R_{\alpha\beta} - 2u_{(\alpha}R_{\beta)\delta}u^\delta\right], \quad (52)$$

$$\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta} = \mathcal{H}_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\sigma\gamma}R^{\sigma\tau}u_\tau u^\gamma, \quad (53)$$

$$\mathbb{F}_{\alpha\beta} = -\mathcal{E}_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{R}{3}\left[g_{\alpha\beta} + u_\alpha u_\beta\right] + \frac{1}{2}\left[g_{\alpha\beta}R_{\gamma\delta}u^\gamma u^\delta - R_{\alpha\beta} - 2u_{(\alpha}R_{\beta)\delta}u^\delta\right]. \quad (54)$$

In the vacuum case $R_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ of the previous subsections the Riemann tensor equals the Weyl tensor. For a non-vacuum Riemann tensor, *everything in the previous subsections holds for the Weyl tensor but not (necessarily) for the Riemann tensor itself*, i.e., everything holds if one replaces $R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}, \mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta}, \mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}, \mathbb{Q}_{\alpha\beta}$ by $C_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$, $\mathcal{E}_{\alpha\beta}$, $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha\beta}$, $\mathcal{Q}_{\alpha\beta} \equiv \mathcal{E}_{\alpha\beta} - i\mathcal{H}_{\alpha\beta}$. As for the Riemann tensor itself, no invariant conditions for the vanishing of $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\gamma}$ or $\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\gamma}$ are actually known in the general case. However, there is one conclusion one can draw, namely that $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} \neq 0$ implies $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta} \neq 0$ for all observers. This can be seen as follows. From (48)-(54) one obtains

$$\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} = \star\mathbf{C}\cdot\mathbf{C} = 16\mathcal{E}^{\alpha\beta}\mathcal{H}_{\alpha\beta}\ .$$

Hence $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} \neq 0$ implies $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha\beta} \neq 0$ for all observers. But by (53) $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha\beta}$ is the symmetric part of $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$, i.e. $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha\beta} = \mathbb{H}_{(\alpha\beta)}$, therefore $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha\beta} \neq 0 \Rightarrow \mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta} \neq 0$.

*Vacuum with cosmological constant*

If there is a non-zero cosmological constant $\Lambda$ but no sources ($T_{\alpha\beta} = 0$, $R_{\alpha\beta} = \Lambda g_{\alpha\beta}$, $R = 4\Lambda \neq 0$), the property (18) still holds and (52)-(53) reduce to

$$\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta} = \mathcal{E}_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{\Lambda}{3}(g_{\alpha\beta} + u_\alpha u_\beta) = -\mathbb{F}_{\alpha\beta}, \quad (55)$$

$$\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta} = \mathcal{H}_{\alpha\beta} \quad (\Rightarrow \mathbb{H}_{[\alpha\beta]} = 0)\ . \quad (56)$$

The invariants $I$, $J$, $\Delta$ and eigenvalues $\lambda_k$ of the Riemann operator $\mathbb{Q}^\alpha{}_\beta$ are related to the corresponding quantities $I_{\rm C}$, $J_{\rm C}$, $\Delta_{\rm C}$, $(\lambda_{\rm C})_k$ associated to the Weyl operator $\mathcal{Q}^\alpha{}_\beta$ by

$$I = I_{\rm C} + \frac{\Lambda^2}{3}, \quad J = J_{\rm C} - \Lambda I_{\rm C} - \frac{\Lambda^3}{9}, \quad \Delta = \Delta_{\rm C}\ ,$$
$$\lambda_k = (\lambda_{\rm C})_k - \frac{\Lambda}{3}\ .$$

From Eq. (56) it follows that the Riemann tensor is purely electric if and only if the Weyl tensor is purely electric; the trace of (55) yields $\mathbb{E}^\alpha{}_\alpha = -\Lambda$, implying that the Riemann tensor is never purely magnetic, i.e., $\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta} \neq 0$ for all observers.

## IV. INTERPRETATION OF THE INVARIANT STRUCTURE OF THE RELEVANT ELECTROMAGNETIC SETUPS

We are especially interested in understanding physically the invariant $\vec{E}\cdot\vec{B}$, and why the magnetic field vanishes for some observers in certain setups. Consider an arbitrary distribution of charges and currents, and an arbitrary congruence of observers $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$ of 4-velocity $u^\alpha$. The projections parallel and orthogonal to $u^\alpha$ of the Maxwell field equations $F^{\alpha\beta}{}_{;\beta} = 4\pi j^\alpha$ and $\star F^{\alpha\beta}{}_{;\beta} = 0$, respectively, yield the source equations for the magnetic field, which, in an orthonormal frame "adapted" to the observers $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$, read (see [34], Sec. 3.4.1 for details)

$$\nabla^\perp \times \vec{B} = \dot{\vec{E}} - \vec{a}\times\vec{B} + 4\pi\vec{j} - \sigma^{\hat{i}\hat{j}}E_{\hat{j}}\vec{e}_{\hat{i}} + \frac{2}{3}\theta\vec{E}\ ; \quad (57)$$

$$\nabla^\perp\cdot\vec{B} = -2\vec{\omega}\cdot\vec{E}\ , \quad (58)$$

where

$$a^\alpha = u^\alpha{}_{;\beta}u^\beta\ ; \qquad \omega^\alpha = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}u_{\gamma;\beta}u_\delta\ ;$$
$$\sigma^{\alpha\beta} = h^\alpha{}_\lambda h^\beta{}_\tau u^{(\lambda;\tau)} - \frac{1}{3}u^\tau{}_{;\tau}\ ; \qquad \theta = u^\alpha{}_{;\alpha} \quad (59)$$

are, respectively, the acceleration, vorticity, shear, and expansion scalar of the observer congruence; $h^\alpha{}_\beta$ is the projector orthogonal to $u^\alpha$ (i.e, the "space" projector),

$$h^\alpha{}_\beta \equiv u^\alpha u_\beta + \delta^\alpha{}_\beta\ , \quad (60)$$

$\nabla^\perp$ is the spatial projection of the Levi-Civita covariant derivative $\nabla$,

$$\nabla^\perp_\gamma X^{\alpha_1\ldots\alpha_n} = h^{\alpha_1}_{\ \beta_1}\ldots h^{\alpha_n}_{\ \beta_n}\nabla_\gamma X^{\beta_1\ldots\beta_n}\ , \quad (61)$$

and dot denotes the ordinary time derivative along the observer's worldline, $\dot{X}^{\hat{\alpha}_1\ldots\hat{\alpha}_n} \equiv u^{\hat{\beta}}\partial_{\hat{\beta}}\dot{X}^{\hat{\alpha}_1\ldots\hat{\alpha}_n}$. Hats in the indices (e.g. $\hat{\imath}$) denote tetrad components. In *an inertial frame*, all the kinematical quantities (59) vanish, $\nabla^\perp_i = \nabla_i$ and Eqs. (57)-(58) take the well known form

$$\nabla\times\vec{B} = \dot{\vec{E}} + 4\pi\vec{j} \quad \text{(i)} \qquad \nabla\cdot\vec{B} = 0 \quad \text{(ii)}. \quad (62)$$

Based on these equations we make the following observations:

1. If $\dot{\vec{E}} + 4\pi\vec{j} \neq \vec{0}$ in an *inertial* frame, then, according to Eq. (62i), $\vec{B}$ cannot vanish in that frame on any *spatial* 3-D open region (only on 2-surfaces or lower dimensional sets).

2. If there exists an *inertial* frame where $\dot{\vec{E}} + 4\pi\vec{j} = \vec{0}$ *everywhere*, and no fields are present other than those arising from the sources, then $\vec{B} = 0$ *globally* in that frame. This implies $\vec{E}\cdot\vec{B} = 0$ everywhere. Example, consider a system of $N$ point charges: if an *inertial* frame exists where they are all at rest, then $\vec{j} = \dot{\vec{E}} = \vec{0}$ and so $\vec{B} = 0 \Rightarrow \vec{E}\cdot\vec{B} = 0$ everywhere (cf. Eq. (67)).

3. Observation 2 is guaranteed *only when* one is dealing with an inertial frame; for in an arbitrary frame, as can be seen from Eqs. (57)-(58), the vorticity and shear/expansion of the observer congruence contribute as sources for $\vec{B}$. Examples: spinning charged body, or a system of point charges in rigid rotational motion (e.g. the rotating pair of charges in Fig. 4); the bodies are at rest with respect to the co-rotating frame, and so $\vec{j} = \dot{\vec{E}} = \vec{0}$ everywhere in this frame. In spite of that, generically $\nabla^\perp \cdot \vec{B} \neq 0 \Rightarrow \vec{B} \neq \vec{0}$, cf. Eq. (58), and *also* $\vec{E}\cdot\vec{B} \neq 0$ generically.

4. The converse of 2 is not true: when there is no inertial frame where $\dot{\vec{E}} + 4\pi\vec{j} = \vec{0}$ everywhere, this does not necessarily mean that $\vec{E} \cdot \vec{B} \neq 0$. The magnetic field can still vanish at some region (3D or lower dimensional) with respect to inertial or non-inertial frames. Even within a region where $\dot{\vec{E}} + 4\pi\vec{j} \neq \vec{0}$, it can vanish with respect to inertial frames at spatial 2-surfaces or lower dimensional sets (cf. point 1), or, for non-inertial frames, even on 3D spatial regions. In fact, from Eq. (57) we see that, in a region where $\dot{\vec{E}} + 4\pi\vec{j} \neq 0$, we can still have $\nabla^\perp \times \vec{B} = 0$ for a non-inertial frame, which is compatible with a vanishing $\vec{B}$. These situations will be exemplified in Secs. IV B-IV D.

Point 1 is just the statement that $\nabla \times \vec{B} \neq 0$ implies that $\vec{B}$ cannot vanish on spatial open sets. To prove point 2, one notes that $\nabla \times \vec{B} = 0$ means that $\vec{B} = \nabla\psi$, for some scalar function $\psi$; then the equation $\nabla \cdot \vec{B} = \nabla^2\psi = 0$ implies (via Green theorem) that if, at infinity, $\vec{B} = 0$ (no sources at infinity), then $\vec{B} = 0$ everywhere.

*Systems of N point charges.*— Systems of point particles are of special interest herein as they may be cast as the building blocks of the classical systems we will study. In the case of gravitational systems, they are studied in the framework of the first order post-Newtonian approximation (1PN); in electromagnetism we shall use an analogous approximation that we dub, following [78], the first "post-Coulombian" (1PC) approximation. It can be stated as follows: one scales, by some small dimensionless parameter $\epsilon$,

$$\frac{q}{m}\phi \sim \epsilon^2; \qquad v \lesssim \epsilon; \qquad v_{\rm s} \lesssim \epsilon \ , \tag{63}$$

where $\phi$ is the Coulomb potential, $q$ and $m$ are the charge and mass of a test particle, $v$ and $v_{\rm s}$ are the velocities of the test particle and of the sources. Time derivatives increase the degree of smallness of a quantity by a factor $\epsilon$; for example, $\partial\phi/\partial t \sim \phi v_{\rm s} \sim \epsilon\phi$. This is thus both a weak field and slow motion assumption. The approximation consists of keeping terms up to $O(\epsilon^4)$ in the equations of motion; take the case of the Lorentz force,

$$\vec{a} = \frac{q}{m}\left(\vec{E} + \vec{v}\times\vec{B}\right) = \frac{q}{m}\left(-\nabla\phi - \partial_t\vec{A} + \vec{v}\times(\nabla\times\vec{A})\right) \ ;$$

in order to know $\vec{a}$ to order $O(\epsilon^4/L)$, one needs to know $q\phi/m$ to order $O(\epsilon^4)$ and $q\vec{A}/m$ to order $O(\epsilon^3)$. For a system of $N$ point charges, this amounts to considering a 4-potential[9] $A^\alpha = (A^0, \vec{A})$ whose components read, in an *inertial* frame,

$$A^0 = \sum_{\rm a} Q_{\rm a}\left[\frac{1}{r_{\rm a}}\left(1 + \frac{v_{\rm a}^2}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\vec{r}_{\rm a}\cdot\vec{a}_{\rm a}\right) - \frac{(\vec{r}_{\rm a}\cdot\vec{v}_{\rm a})^2}{2r_{\rm a}^3}\right] \ ; \tag{64}$$

$$\vec{A} = \frac{\sum_{\rm a} Q_{\rm a}\vec{v}_{\rm a}}{r_{\rm a}} \ , \tag{65}$$

where $Q_{\rm a}$ is the charge of particle "a", $\vec{r}_{\rm a} \equiv \vec{x} - \vec{x}_{\rm a}$, $\vec{x}$ is the point of observation, $\vec{x}_{\rm a}$ is the instantaneous position of particle "a", $\vec{v}_{\rm a} = \partial\vec{x}_{\rm a}/\partial t$ its velocity and $\vec{a}_{\rm a} = \partial\vec{v}_{\rm a}/\partial t$ its acceleration; for a system of interacting bodies *with no external forces*, to 1PC accuracy, $\vec{a}_{\rm a}$ is to be taken in Eq. (64) as the acceleration caused by the Coulomb field produced by the other charges, i.e., $\vec{a}_{\rm a} = (Q_{\rm a}/m_{\rm a})\sum_{\rm b\neq a} Q_{\rm b}\vec{r}_{\rm ab}/r_{\rm ab}^3$, with $\vec{r}_{\rm ab} \equiv \vec{x}_{\rm a} - \vec{x}_{\rm b}$. The 1PC electric and magnetic fields, $\vec{E} = -\nabla A^0 - \partial_t\vec{A}$ and $\vec{B} = \nabla\times\vec{A}$, follow as

$$\vec{E} \ = \ \sum_{\rm a} Q_{\rm a}(1+\varphi_{\rm a})\frac{\vec{r}_{\rm a}}{r_{\rm a}^3} - \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\rm a} Q_{\rm a}\frac{\vec{a}_{\rm a}}{r_{\rm a}} \ ; \tag{66}$$

$$\vec{B} \ = \ \sum_{\rm a}\frac{Q_{\rm a}}{r_{\rm a}^3}\vec{v}_{\rm a}\times\vec{r}_{\rm a} = \sum_{\rm a}\vec{v}_{\rm a}\times\left[\vec{E}_{\rm a}\right]_{\rm C} \ , \tag{67}$$

where

$$\varphi_{\rm a} \equiv \frac{v_{\rm a}^2}{2} - \frac{1}{2}(\vec{r}_{\rm a}\cdot\vec{a}_{\rm a}) - \frac{3}{2}\frac{(\vec{r}_{\rm a}\cdot\vec{v}_{\rm a})^2}{r_{\rm a}^2}$$

and $\left[\vec{E}_{\rm a}\right]_{\rm C} = Q_{\rm a}\vec{r}_{\rm a}/r_{\rm a}^3$ denotes the Coulomb (i.e., 0PC) electric field of particle "a".

We shall next discuss the electromagnetic invariants and the fields measured by different observers in setups which may be cast as the analogues of the gravitational systems of interest, and where the observations 1-4 above will be exemplified.

### A. One single point charge

In the inertial rest frame of the charge, one has $A^\alpha = (\frac{Q}{r}, 0, 0, 0)$, $\vec{E} = (Q/r^2)\vec{e}_r$, $\vec{B} = 0$. The two scalar invari-

[9] These expressions follow from Eqs. (2.73)-(2.74) of [78], for the case of zero gravitational field, setting $\mu_0 = \varepsilon_0 = 1$ therein. They could also be obtained from the exact Liénard-Wiechert retarded potentials Eqs. (14.8) of [32] (superimposing the potentials of single moving particles given therein, since electromagnetism is linear), expanding them to 1PC order, and noting that to 1PC order the instantaneous relative position $\vec{r}_{\rm a}$ is related by a quadratic extrapolation to the retarded relative position $\vec{R}_{\rm a}$, $\vec{r}_{\rm a} \simeq \vec{R}_{\rm a} - \vec{v}R_{\rm a} - \frac{1}{2}\vec{a}_{\rm a}R_{\rm a}^2$.

ants of $F_{\alpha\beta}$ are

$$\vec{E}^2 - \vec{B}^2 = \frac{Q^2}{r^4} > 0 \ , \qquad \vec{E}\cdot\vec{B} = 0 \ \text{(everywhere)} \ , \quad (68)$$

telling us that $F_{\alpha\beta}$ is purely electric (everywhere), i.e., everywhere there are observers for which $B^\alpha = 0$. Those are the observers at rest in the inertial rest frame of the source (*"static"* observers), and also observers in purely radial motion, since, as we have seen in Sec. II A, the component $\vec{v}_{\|E}$ along $\vec{E}$ of the velocity of the observers measuring no magnetic field is arbitrary. In other words, such observers have a 4-velocity of the form $u'^\alpha = (u'^0, u'^r, 0, 0)$ (cf. the explicit expressions for $B'^\alpha$ in Sec. III.A of [58]).

In order to understand the invariant structure (68), let $\mathcal{S}$ and $\mathcal{S}'$ be, respectively, the inertial rest frame of the point charge, and an inertial frame moving relative to it with some velocity $\vec{v}$ (non-parallel to $\vec{E}$). In $\mathcal{S}$, $\vec{B} = 0$ *globally*, which implies $\vec{E}\cdot\vec{B} = 0$ *everywhere*. Observers $\mathcal{O}'$ at rest in $\mathcal{S}'$, in turn, measure a non-zero magnetic field $\vec{B}'$; but it is such that it is always orthogonal to $\vec{E}'$, ensuring $\vec{E}'\cdot\vec{B}' = 0$, as we shall now explicitly show. By equation (10) [or its covariant form (8)],

$$\vec{B}' = -\gamma\vec{v}\times\vec{E} \ , \qquad \left[B'^\alpha = -\epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}E_\gamma u_\delta u'_\beta\right] \ . \quad (69)$$

Thus, $\vec{B}'$ is perpendicular to the electric field $\vec{E}$ measured in the charge's rest frame and to the velocity $\vec{v}$; hence it is also perpendicular to $\vec{E}'$, as is seen from (9):

$$\vec{E}' = \gamma\vec{E} - \frac{\gamma^2}{\gamma+1}\vec{v}\left(\vec{v}\cdot\vec{E}\right) \ . \quad (70)$$

### B. System of two point charges

We shall now consider two moving charged particles with charges $Q_1$, $Q_2$ of the same sign. If they move with different velocities with respect to some inertial frame, then there is no inertial frame where they are *both* at rest. From Eq. (62i) we see that, by contrast with the example in the previous section, in this case the magnetic field cannot vanish *globally* in an inertial frame. Let us see how this reflects in the invariants. The electric field $\vec{E}$, at an arbitrary point $P$ of coordinates $\vec{x}$, is, from Eq. (66),

$$\vec{E} = \frac{Q_1}{r_1^3}(1+\varphi_1)\vec{r}_1 + \frac{Q_2}{r_2^3}(1+\varphi_2)\vec{r}_2 - \frac{1}{2}Q_1\frac{\vec{a}_1}{r_1} - \frac{1}{2}Q_2\frac{\vec{a}_2}{r_2} \ , \quad (71)$$

where $\vec{r}_1 = \vec{x} - \vec{x}_1$, $\vec{r}_2 = \vec{x} - \vec{x}_1$. The magnetic field is, cf. Eq. (67),

$$\vec{B} = \frac{Q_1}{r_1^3}\vec{v}_1\times\vec{r}_1 + \frac{Q_2}{r_2^3}\vec{v}_2\times\vec{r}_2 \ . \quad (72)$$

In an arbitrary point the invariant $\vec{E}\cdot\vec{B}$ is

$$\vec{E}\cdot\vec{B} = \frac{Q_1}{r_1^3}(\vec{v}_1\times\vec{r}_1)\cdot\left[\frac{Q_2}{r_2^3}(1+\varphi_2)\vec{r}_2 - \frac{1}{2}Q_1\frac{\vec{a}_1}{r_1} - \frac{1}{2}Q_2\frac{\vec{a}_2}{r_2}\right] + \frac{Q_2}{r_2^3}(\vec{v}_2\times\vec{r}_2)\cdot\left[\frac{Q_1}{r_1^3}(1+\varphi_1)\vec{r}_1 - \frac{1}{2}Q_1\frac{\vec{a}_1}{r_1} - \frac{1}{2}Q_2\frac{\vec{a}_2}{r_2}\right] \quad (73)$$

which is generically non-vanishing. To lowest order,

$$\vec{E}\cdot\vec{B} \simeq \frac{Q_1Q_2}{r_1^3r_2^3}\left[(\vec{v}_1\times\vec{r}_1)\cdot\vec{r}_2 + (\vec{v}_2\times\vec{r}_2)\cdot\vec{r}_1\right] \ . \quad (74)$$

As for the invariant $\vec{E}^2 - \vec{B}^2$, there is a region between the two charges where $\vec{B}^2 > \vec{E}^2$ (magnetic dominance), around the point where $\vec{E} \simeq \frac{Q_1}{r_1^3}\vec{r}_1 + \frac{Q_2}{r_2^3}\vec{r}_2 = 0$; elsewhere $\vec{E}^2 \geq \vec{B}^2$.

#### *Coplanar motion*

Take now the case when $\vec{v}_1$, $\vec{v}_2$ and the position vectors of the bodies are coplanar (i.e., the two bodies move in the same plane). It follows that $\vec{E}\cdot\vec{B}$ vanishes in the plane of the motion, and is generically non-zero outside that plane. It is easy to see from Eq. (73) that in the plane of the motion $\vec{E}\cdot\vec{B} = 0$: taking the point of observation $P$ to lie on that plane, then the $\vec{r}_{\rm a}$, $\vec{v}_{\rm a}$ and $\vec{a}_{\rm a}$ all lie on that plane; hence $(\vec{v}_{\rm a}\times\vec{r}_{\rm a})\cdot\vec{r}_{\rm b} = (\vec{v}_{\rm a}\times\vec{r}_{\rm a})\cdot\vec{a}_{\rm b} = 0$. This means that, in this plane, there are observers for which the magnetic field vanishes.

We will investigate such observers in the simple example in Fig. 4, that will prove enlightening for the next section (where we study the field produced by a spinning body): two particles, with equal charge $Q$, in circular motion of radius $d$ and in antipodal positions (e.g., with some rod holding them), so that their velocities are equal in magnitude but opposite in direction: $\vec{v}_1 = -\vec{v}_2$.




Figure 4: Two equal charges in antipodal circular motion — observers $\mathcal{O}'$ for which the magnetic field vanishes (represented only along the axis passing through the particles); their velocity $\vec{v}$ is depicted by black dashed arrows.

In this special case $\vec{a}_1 = a(\vec{r}_1 - \vec{r}_2)/2d$, $\vec{a}_2 = a(\vec{r}_2 - \vec{r}_1)/2d$ and $(\vec{v}_2 \times \vec{r}_2)\cdot\vec{r}_1 = (\vec{v}_1 \times \vec{r}_1)\cdot\vec{r}_2$, such that Eq. (73) simplifies to

$$\vec{E}\cdot\vec{B} \;=\; Q^2\left[\frac{2+\varphi_2+\varphi_1}{r_1^3 r_2^3} + \frac{a}{4d}\left(\frac{1}{r_1}-\frac{1}{r_2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{r_1^3}-\frac{1}{r_2^3}\right)\right] (\vec{v}_1\times\vec{r}_1)\cdot\vec{r}_2 \;, \tag{75}$$

which has the structure

$$\begin{cases} \vec{E}\cdot\vec{B} = 0 \text{ in the plane of motion,} \\ \vec{E}\cdot\vec{B} \neq 0 \text{ elsewhere.} \end{cases}$$

That $\vec{E}\cdot\vec{B} \neq 0$ at any point outside the plane of the motion (denote it by $\Sigma$) can be seen as follows. First note that the first line of (75) cannot be zero, since by the 1PC assumptions all terms must be much smaller than the first one ($2Q^2/r_1^3 r_2^3$). Then note that $(\vec{v}_1\times\vec{r}_1)\cdot\vec{r}_2 = (\vec{v}_1\times[\vec{r}_1-\vec{r}_2])\cdot\vec{r}_2$. Since $\vec{r}_1-\vec{r}_2 \in \Sigma$, the vector $\vec{v}_1\times[\vec{r}_1-\vec{r}_2]$ is orthogonal to $\Sigma$; hence $\vec{E}\cdot\vec{B}=0$ only if $\vec{r}_2$ lies on $\Sigma$, which is possible only if the point of observation $P\in\Sigma$; at any point $P$ outside $\Sigma$, $\vec{E}\cdot\vec{B}\neq 0$. This means that *outside* $\Sigma$ the magnetic field is *non-vanishing for all observers*, and that *in* $\Sigma$ *there are observers for which* $\vec{B}'=0$. From Eq. (15), such observers must have a velocity whose component orthogonal to $\vec{E}$, $\vec{v}_{\perp E} = \vec{v}_{\parallel p}$, reads

$$\vec{v}_{\perp E} = \frac{r_2^4\vec{v}_{1\perp r_1} - r_1^4\vec{v}_{1\perp r_2} + r_1 r_2\left[(\vec{r}_1\cdot\vec{v}_1)\vec{r}_2 - (\vec{r}_2\cdot\vec{v}_1)\vec{r}_1\right]}{r_1^4 + r_2^4 + 2r_1 r_2 \vec{r}_1\cdot\vec{r}_2}\;, \tag{76}$$

where $\vec{v}_{1\perp r_1}$ and $\vec{v}_{1\perp r_2}$ are the components of $\vec{v}_1$ orthogonal to $\vec{r}_1$ and $\vec{r}_2$, respectively. We first notice that $\vec{v}_{\perp E}$, and, therefore, $\vec{v}$ (since $\vec{E}$ at points on $\Sigma$ lies on $\Sigma$, except at the middle point $\vec{r}_1 = -\vec{r}_2$ where $\vec{E}=0$) lies on the plane of motion $\Sigma$. The reason why $\vec{B}'$ vanishes for these observers is especially easy to understand along the axis passing through the two particles, see Fig. 4. First note that, clearly, the magnetic field at $P$, as measured by the static observer $\mathcal{O}$, is non-vanishing, because although the magnetic field produced by particle 1 acts in opposite direction to the magnetic field from particle 2, the latter is closer to $P$ so that the two fields do not cancel out. By choosing an observer $\mathcal{O}'$ moving with 3-velocity $\vec{v}$ in the same direction as particle 2, one is decreasing particle 2's velocity, and, at the same time, increasing particle 1's velocity relative to the observer's inertial rest frame. That means *decreasing* the magnetic field $\vec{B}'_2$ generated by particle 2 and *increasing* the magnetic field $\vec{B}'_1$ generated by particle 1, so that eventually one can make the (total) magnetic field $\vec{B}' = \vec{B}'_1 + \vec{B}'_2$ vanish. Along the axis (with $r_1 = r+d$, $r_2 = r-d$, cf. Fig. 4), the observers $\mathcal{O}'$ for which $\vec{B}'=0$ have velocities

$$\vec{v} = \vec{v}_1\frac{-2dr}{(r^2+d^2)} \quad\Rightarrow\quad v \overset{r\gg d}{\simeq} \frac{2v_1 d}{r} = \frac{2J}{M_{\rm tot} r} \tag{77}$$

where $M_{\rm tot} = M_1 + M_2 = 2M_1$ is the system's total mass, and we noted that $M_{\rm tot} v_1 d = J$ is the system's angular momentum as measured in the center of mass frame.

### C. Spinning spherical charge

Consider a spinning charged spherical body with mass $M$, angular momentum $\vec{J} = J\vec{e}_z$, charge $Q$ and dipole moment $\vec{\mu}_{\rm s} = (Q/2M)J\vec{e}_z$. The electric and magnetic fields produced are, as measured by the rest observers,

$$\vec{E} = \frac{Q}{r^2}\vec{e}_r\;, \qquad \vec{B} = \frac{2\mu_{\rm s}\cos\theta}{r^3}\vec{e}_r + \frac{\mu_{\rm s}\sin\theta}{r^4}\vec{e}_\theta\;, \tag{78}$$

where $\vec{e}_i \equiv \vec{\partial}_i$ denote *coordinate* basis vectors. The invariants are given by[10]:

$$\begin{cases} \vec{E}^2 - \vec{B}^2 = \dfrac{Q^2}{r^4} - \dfrac{\mu_{\rm s}^2(5+3\cos 2\theta)}{2r^6} > 0\;, \\ \vec{E}\cdot\vec{B} = \dfrac{2\mu_{\rm s} Q\cos\theta}{r^5} \qquad (\vec{E}\cdot\vec{B}=0 \text{ in the plane } \theta=\pi/2)\;. \end{cases} \tag{79}$$

Since $\vec{E}\cdot\vec{B}=0$ in the equatorial plane ($\theta=\pi/2$), observers $\mathcal{O}'$ exist in this plane for which $\vec{B}'=0$. From Eq. (15), the velocity of those observers is such that its component $\vec{v}_{\perp E} = \vec{v}_{\parallel p}$ orthogonal to $\vec{E}$ is

$$\vec{v}_{\perp E} = \frac{\vec{E}\times\vec{B}}{\vec{E}^2} = \frac{\mu_{\rm s}}{Qr^2}\vec{e}_\phi\;,$$

no restriction being imposed on the (radial) component $\vec{v}_{\parallel E} = v^r\vec{e}_r$ parallel to $\vec{E}$ (apart from the normalization condition $u'^\alpha u'_\alpha = -1$). That is, observers moving in the equatorial plane ($\vec{v}_\theta = 0$) with angular velocity

$$\frac{d\phi}{dt} = \frac{u'^\phi}{u'^t} = \frac{\mu_{\rm s}}{Qr^2} = \frac{J}{2Mr^2} \tag{80}$$

measure a vanishing magnetic field. One might check that these are indeed the only observers for which $B'^\alpha = 0$ by computing explicitly $B'^\alpha$ for an arbitrary 4-velocity $u'^\alpha = (u'^t, u'^r, u'^\theta, u'^\phi)$, as done in [58]. If we take the *special case* $v^r = u'^r = 0$, we obtain the velocity field $\vec{v} = J/(2Mr^2)\vec{e}_\phi$ depicted in Fig. 5.

---

[10] The first inequality always holds assuming the classical gyromagnetic ratio $\mu_{\rm s}/J = Q/2M$, corresponding to a classical source where the charge and mass are identically distributed. In that case

$$\frac{\mu_{\rm s}^2}{r^6} = \frac{Q^2}{4r^6}\frac{J^2}{M^2} \leq \frac{1}{4}\frac{Q^2}{r^3}\frac{R^2}{r^2}$$

where $R$ is the body's radius and we have used the fact that, in order for the dominant energy condition to be obeyed, $R \geq J/M$, see [75]. Since $r > R$ at any point exterior to the particle, we have $\mu_{\rm s}^2/r^6 < Q^2/r^4 \Rightarrow \vec{E}^2 - \vec{B}^2 > 0$.




Figure 5: Observers for which the magnetic field vanishes. (Note that these are *not* observers "co-rotating" with the same angular velocity of the spinning body). $\vec{e}_\phi$ is the coordinate basis vector $\vec{e}_\phi \equiv \vec{\partial}_\phi = r\vec{e}_{\hat{\phi}}$. Observer $\mathcal{O}'$ at point $P$ must have a velocity that decreases the magnetic field generated by the charge elements of the closer hemisphere (e.g., charge element 2), and increases the magnetic field produced by the charge elements of the opposite hemisphere (e.g., charge element 1), such that they eventually cancel out.

The vanishing of $\vec{B}'$ for such observers can be understood in the same spirit as in the case of the two point charges in coplanar motion of Fig. 4. A rotating charged body may be decomposed in arbitrarily small charge elements in translation; and its electromagnetic field (78) cast as a superposition of the field produced by each such elements. In particular, to 1PC order, we may write for $\vec{B}$ (cf. Eq. (67))

$$\vec{B}(\vec{r}) = \int_{\text{body}} \rho_{\text{c}} \frac{\vec{v}_{\text{c}}(\vec{x}') \times (\vec{r} - \vec{x}')}{|\vec{r} - \vec{x}'|^3} d^3\vec{x}' \ , \qquad (81)$$

where $\vec{v}_{\text{c}}(\vec{x}')$ is the velocity of the charge element $\rho_{\text{c}} d^3\vec{x}'$ at the point $\vec{x}'$. Consider the situation in Fig. 5. Relative to an observer at rest at a point $P$ of the equatorial plane, the charge elements in the closer hemisphere (e.g., charge element 2) move in opposite direction to the ones in the opposite hemisphere (e.g., charge element 1), so their contributions $\vec{v}_{\text{c}}(\vec{x}') \times (\vec{r} - \vec{x}')$ to the integral (81) have opposite signs. The net field $\vec{B}$ is different from zero because one hemisphere is closer than the other (leading to a dipole field). The observers $\mathcal{O}'$ for which $\vec{B}' = 0$ at $P$ must move in the same sense as the rotational motion of the body, thereby decreasing the relative velocity of the charge elements in the closer hemisphere (decreasing the magnitude of their magnetic field), and increasing the relative velocity of the elements in the farther hemisphere (increasing the magnitude of their magnetic field), with a suitable velocity $\vec{v}$ such that the fields from the two hemispheres cancel out.

Notice the similarity with the result obtained in Sec. IV B: the magnitude of the velocity field in Fig. 5 is $v = J/2Mr$, which, up to a factor of four, matches the asymptotic behavior of the field (77) depicted in Fig. 4.

Using Eq. (10), and noting that $\vec{B} \cdot \vec{v} = 0$ to obtain $\vec{B}' = \gamma\vec{B} - \gamma\vec{v} \times \vec{E}$, one can also interpret the vanishing of $\vec{B}'$ for the observers in Fig. 5 as a cancellation between the magnetic field $\gamma\vec{B}$ arising from the rotational motion of the source and the magnetic field $-\gamma\vec{v} \times \vec{E}$ arising from the translational motion of the source relative to the observer. The fact that such cancellation may occur only in the equatorial plane is easy to see noting that since the translational magnetic field $-\gamma\vec{v} \times \vec{E}$ is orthogonal to $\vec{E}$, it can kill the rotational field only if $\vec{B}$ is also orthogonal to $\vec{E}$ which, for this setup, happens only in the equatorial plane.

Finally, notice that the observers in Fig. 5 exemplify one case of point 4 of Sec. IV: there is no *inertial* frame where the different charge elements are at rest[11], i.e., where $\vec{j} = 0$ everywhere; moreover, as in the two-body system of Sec. IV B, the magnetic field does not *globally* vanish in any inertial frame. Yet, in a spatial 2-surface, there are still observers measuring no magnetic field, only they do not form an inertial frame (take e.g. the congruence with $d\phi/dt$ given by (80), and $u'^\theta = u'^r = 0$; such congruence is accelerated and shears[12]).

### D. Further examples — infinite rotating cylinder

Here we consider a simple physical system that exemplifies the remaining cases mentioned in point 4 of Sec. IV. Consider the electromagnetic field produced by a uniform, rotating, and infinitely long cylinder of radius $R$ and charge density $\rho_{\text{c}}$. The electric and magnetic fields, as measured by static observers, read, in cylindrical coordinates $(r, \phi, z)$,

$$r < R: \quad \vec{E} = 2\pi\rho_{\text{c}} r\vec{e}_r \ ; \qquad \vec{B} = 2\pi\rho_{\text{c}}\Omega(R^2 - r^2)\vec{e}_z \ ;$$
$$r \geq R: \quad \vec{E} = \frac{2\pi\rho_{\text{c}} R^2}{r}\vec{e}_r \ ; \qquad \vec{B} = \vec{0} \ .$$

It follows that $\vec{E} \cdot \vec{B} = 0$ everywhere, and $\vec{E}^2 - \vec{B}^2 > 0$ ($< 0$) for $r > r_{\text{c}} (< r_{\text{c}})$, where the critical radius $r_{\text{c}}^2 = R^2 + (1 - \sqrt{1 + 4R^2\Omega^2})/(2\Omega^2)$ defines the boundary between the *purely* electric/magnetic regions, and lies inside the

[11] In a co-rotating frame the whole spinning body is at rest; but such frame consists of a congruence of observers all having *different* 4-velocities $U^\alpha$, thus different inertial rest frames, whilst having the same angular velocity. Actually, no single point in the body is at rest with respect to the inertial frame of a co-rotating observer if the latter lies outside the body. $\vec{B}$ does *not* vanish in the co-rotating frame, even though the body is at rest therein (so $\vec{j} = \vec{E} = 0$); taking the perspective of such frame, this is justified with the fact that the vorticity of the observer congruence contributes as a source for $\vec{B}$, cf. Eqs. (57)-(58).

[12] For the congruence $u'^\alpha = u'^0(1, 0, 0, d\phi/dt)$, with $u'^0 = 1/\sqrt{1 - (d\phi/dt)^2 g_{\phi\phi}}$, the non-vanishing components of the acceleration and shear are, in the equatorial plane, $a^r = a^2/(a^2 r - 4r^3)$, $\sigma_{r\phi} = \sigma_{\phi r} = -4ar^2/(4r^2 - a^2)^{3/2}$, $\sigma_{rt} = \sigma_{tr} = 2a^2/(4r^2 - a^2)^{3/2}$, where $a \equiv J/M$. The vorticity and expansion vanish in that plane.

cylinder ($r_{\rm c} < R$). The magnetic field $\vec{B}$ vanishes at every point outside the cylinder in the inertial frame of the static observers; this exemplifies one of the situations in point 4 of Sec. IV: even when there is no inertial frame where the currents are zero everywhere, still $\vec{B}$ can vanish in a 3D region relative to an inertial frame. Inside the cylinder, for $r > r_{\rm c}$ (purely electric region), it vanishes for certain observers. Such observers have a velocity whose component orthogonal to $\vec{E}$ is obtained from Eq. (15),

$$\vec{v}_{\perp E} = \frac{\vec{E}\times\vec{B}}{\vec{E}^2} = \frac{\Omega(R^2-r^2)}{r}\vec{e}_r\times\vec{e}_z = \Omega\left[\frac{R^2}{r^2}-1\right]\vec{e}_\phi \ ;$$

i.e., observers with angular velocity $d\phi/dt = \Omega\left[R^2/r^2-1\right]$ (in the sense of the cylinder's rotation). Such observer congruences are not inertial, as they are shearing, rotating and accelerating. This exemplifies another situation in point 4 of Sec. IV: with respect to non-inertial frames, even in a 3D region where $\vec{j}\neq 0$, one can have $\vec{B}=\vec{0}$.

## V. INTERPRETATION OF THE INVARIANT STRUCTURE FOR THE RELEVANT GRAVITATIONAL SETUPS

In the gravitational case we are interested in understanding the curvature invariants of the gravitational fields of current experimental interest, in particular the Chern-Pontryagin invariant $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}$ and its vanishing in some setups.

From the differential Bianchi identities $R_{\alpha\beta[\gamma\delta;\mu]}=0$, written in terms of the electric part $\mathcal{E}_{\alpha\beta}=C_{\alpha\gamma\beta\sigma}u^\gamma u^\sigma$ and magnetic part $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha\beta}=\star C_{\alpha\gamma\beta\sigma}u^\gamma u^\sigma$ of the Weyl tensor with respect to the observers $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$, see (51), one obtains the source equations for $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha\beta}$ [80], which read[13], in an orthonormal frame "adapted" [34] to the observers,

$$\begin{aligned}
{\rm curl}\mathcal{H}_{\hat{i}\hat{j}} &= \dot{\mathcal{E}}_{\hat{i}\hat{j}} + \omega^{\hat{m}}\epsilon_{\hat{m}\hat{k}(\hat{i}}\mathcal{E}_{\hat{j})}{}^{\hat{k}} - 3\sigma_{\hat{k}\langle\hat{i}}\mathcal{E}_{\hat{\nu}\rangle}{}^{\hat{\tau}} - 2a^{\hat{k}}\epsilon_{\hat{k}\hat{m}(\hat{i}}\mathcal{H}_{\hat{j})}{}^{\hat{m}} \\
&\quad + \mathcal{E}_{\hat{i}\hat{j}}\theta + 4\pi\Big[(\rho+p)\sigma_{\hat{i}\hat{j}} + \nabla^\perp_{\langle\hat{i}}\mathcal{J}_{\hat{j}\rangle} + 2a_{\langle\hat{i}}\mathcal{J}_{\hat{j}\rangle} \\
&\quad + \dot{\pi}_{\hat{i}\hat{j}} + \omega^{\hat{m}}\epsilon_{\hat{m}\hat{k}(\hat{i}}\pi_{\hat{j})}{}^{\hat{k}} + \frac{\theta}{3}\pi_{\hat{i}\hat{j}} + \sigma^{\hat{k}}{}_{\langle\hat{i}}\pi_{\hat{j}\rangle\hat{k}}\Big] \ ; \quad (82) \\
\nabla^\perp_{\hat{j}}\mathcal{H}^{\hat{j}}{}_{\hat{i}} &= -3\omega^{\hat{j}}\mathcal{E}_{\hat{i}\hat{j}} - \epsilon_{\hat{i}\hat{j}\hat{k}}\sigma^{\hat{j}}{}_{\hat{m}}\mathcal{E}^{\hat{k}\hat{m}} - 4\pi\left[2(\rho+p)\omega_{\hat{i}}\right. \\
&\quad \left. - \epsilon_{\hat{i}\hat{j}\hat{k}}\sigma^{\hat{j}}{}_{\hat{m}}\pi^{\hat{m}\hat{k}} + \pi_{\hat{i}\hat{j}}\omega^{\hat{j}} + (\nabla^\perp\times\vec{\mathcal{J}})_{\hat{i}}\right] \ , \quad (83)
\end{aligned}$$

[13] To obtain Eqs. (82)-(83) from (6.34)-(6.35) of [80], one notes that the "dot" derivative in [80], Eq. (4.6) therein, denotes $\nabla_{\mathbf{u}}=u^\alpha\nabla_\alpha$ (not an ordinary time derivative, as it does in the present paper); that for a spatial, traceless, and symmetric 2-tensor, $\nabla_{\mathbf{u}}\mathcal{E}^{\langle\hat{i}\hat{j}\rangle} = \nabla^\perp_{\mathbf{u}}\mathcal{E}^{\hat{i}\hat{j}} = \dot{\mathcal{E}}^{\hat{i}\hat{j}} + 2\Gamma^{(\hat{i}}_{\hat{0}\hat{k}}\mathcal{E}^{\hat{j})\hat{k}} = \dot{\mathcal{E}}^{\hat{i}\hat{j}} + 2\omega^{(\hat{i}}_{\ \ \hat{k}}\mathcal{E}^{\hat{j})\hat{k}}$ (see the connection coefficients in [34], with $\vec{\Omega}=\vec{\omega}$); and that $\omega_{\gamma\langle\alpha}\mathcal{E}_{\beta\rangle}{}^\gamma = \omega_{\gamma(\alpha}\mathcal{E}_{\beta)}{}^\gamma$ and $\omega^\gamma{}_{\langle\alpha}\pi_{\beta\rangle\gamma} = \omega_{\gamma(\alpha}\pi_{\beta)}{}^\gamma$.

where ${\rm curl}A_{\alpha\beta}\equiv -\epsilon^{\gamma\mu\nu}{}_{(\alpha}A_{\beta)\nu;\mu}u_\gamma$ and the index notation $\langle\mu\nu\rangle$ stands for the spatially projected, symmetric and trace-free part of a rank two tensor:

$$A_{\langle\mu\nu\rangle}\equiv h_{(\mu}{}^\alpha h^\beta_{\nu)}A_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{1}{3}h_{\mu\nu}h_{\alpha\beta}A^{\alpha\beta} \ ,$$

with $h^\alpha{}_\beta$ defined in Eq. (60). In these equations $\rho\equiv T^{\alpha\beta}u_\alpha u_\beta$ is the mass/energy density, $\mathcal{J}^\alpha\equiv -h^\alpha{}_\beta T^{\beta\gamma}u_\gamma$ is the spatial mass/energy current density as measured by an observer of 4-velocity $u^\alpha$, $p=T^{\alpha\beta}h_{\alpha\beta}/3$ is the pressure, and $\pi^{\alpha\beta}\equiv T^{\langle\alpha\beta\rangle}$ is the *traceless* spatial projection of $T^{\alpha\beta}$ with respect to $u^\alpha$ (i.e., the traceless stress tensor, cf. [80] Eq. (5.9)). The tensors $\mathcal{E}_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha\beta}$ are related to the electric and magnetic parts of the Riemann tensor, $\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$, by Eqs. (52)-(53). We note in particular that

$$\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta} = \mathcal{H}_{\alpha\beta} - 4\pi\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\sigma\gamma}\mathcal{J}^\sigma u^\gamma \ . \quad (84)$$

Equations (82)-(83) exhibit formal similarities with Maxwell's equations (57)-(58).

The gravitational fields of the astrophysical setups of interest are considered in the literature at post-Newtonian accuracy. Such approximation may be cast as follows. One scales

$$U\sim\epsilon^2 \ ; \qquad v\lesssim\epsilon \ ; \qquad v_{\rm s}\lesssim\epsilon \ ,$$

where $U$ is the Newtonian potential and $v_s, v$ are the velocities of the sources and of the test particle. The first post-Newtonian order (1PN) consists of keeping terms up to $O(\epsilon^4)$ in the equations of motion (see e.g. [78] Sec. 4.1 (b)). This amounts to considering a metric of the form [18, 31, 69]

$$\begin{aligned}
&g_{00} = -1 + 2w - 2w^2 + O(\epsilon^6) \\
&g_{i0} = \mathcal{A}_i + O(\epsilon^5); \qquad g_{ij} = \delta_{ij}\left(1+2U\right) + O(\epsilon^4) \quad (85)
\end{aligned}$$

where $w=U+O(\epsilon^4)$, and $\vec{\mathcal{A}}$ is the "gravitomagnetic vector potential". The electric and magnetic parts of the Riemann tensor, as measured by an observer at rest ($u^i=0$) in the coordinate system of (85)) are, using the 1PN Christoffel symbols (e.g. Eqs. (8.15) of [77]),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{ij} &= -w_{,ij} + \dot{\mathcal{A}}_{(i,j)} + 3U_{,i}U_{,j} \\
&\quad -\delta_{ij}(\ddot{U} + (\nabla U)^2) + O(\epsilon^6/L^2) \ ; \quad (86) \\
\mathbb{H}_{ij} &= -\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_i{}^{lk}\mathcal{A}_{k,lj} - \epsilon_{ij}{}^k\dot{U}_{,k} + O(\epsilon^5/L^2) \ . \quad (87)
\end{aligned}$$

It is useful to note that *to the accuracy at hand,* one may substitute into Eq. (87)

$$\vec{\mathcal{A}}(x) = -4\int\frac{\vec{\mathcal{J}}}{|\vec{x}-\vec{x}'|}d^3\vec{x}' \ ; \qquad \dot{U}(x) = -\int\frac{\nabla\cdot\vec{\mathcal{J}}}{|\vec{x}-\vec{x}'|}d^3\vec{x}' \ . \quad (88)$$

In $\dot{U}$ we used the relation (see e.g. [76]) $\partial\rho/\partial t = -\nabla\cdot\vec{\mathcal{J}} + O(\rho_{,j}\epsilon^3)$, which is an approximation (accurate enough *for*

*Eq.* (87)) to the conservation equation $T^{0\beta}_{\ \ ;\beta}=0$. We may also re-write Eqs. (82)-(83) to 1PN order,

$$\mathrm{curl}\mathcal{H}_{ij} \;=\; [\dot{\mathcal{E}}_{ij}]_{\rm N} + 4\pi\mathcal{J}_{\langle i,j\rangle} + O(\epsilon^5/L^3)\;; \quad (89)$$

$$\mathcal{H}^{j}_{\ \ i,j} \;=\; -4\pi(\nabla\times\vec{\mathcal{J}})_i + O(\epsilon^5/L^3), \quad (90)$$

where $[\mathcal{E}_{ij}]_{\rm N}$ is the *traceless* Newtonian (i.e., 0PN) tidal tensor, $[\mathcal{E}_{ij}]_{\rm N}=-U_{,ij}+\delta_{ij}U^{k}_{\ \ ,k}/3$, and we noted that the shear of a 1PN frame vanishes, $\sigma_{ij}=(\Gamma^{i}_{0j}+\Gamma^{j}_{0i})/2-\dot{U}\delta_{ij}=0$, and that $\vec{\omega}=\nabla\times\vec{\mathcal{A}}/2\sim O(\epsilon^3/L)$, $\theta=3\dot{U}\sim O(\epsilon^3/L)$, $\mathcal{J}^i\sim O(\rho\epsilon)$, $\pi_{ij}\sim O(\rho\epsilon^2)\sim p$, and $\rho\sim O(\epsilon^3/L^2)$ (via $\nabla^2U\simeq -4\pi\rho$). It is important in this context to notice that the neglect of the terms involving contractions of the tensors $\mathcal{E}_{\alpha\beta}$ or $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha\beta}$ with the kinematical quantities (59) embodies a restriction on the type of reference frame (for, e.g., if one chooses an accelerated or rapidly rotating frame, even for weak sources or in the far field regime, one could not neglect the terms involving the vorticity and acceleration); it is reasonable in post-Newtonian frames [31, 71, 76] (such as the one associated to the coordinate system of the metric (85)), because they are as close as possible to inertial frames.

Eqs. (89)-(90), together with (87)-(88), allow one to draw conclusions to some extent analogous to points 1-4 of Sec. IV, using PN frames instead of inertial frames:

1. If, in a PN frame, the right-hand side of Eqs. (89) or (90) is non-zero, then $\mathcal{H}_{ij}\neq 0\Rightarrow\mathbb{H}_{ij}\neq 0$ *in that frame* (it can be zero only on 2-surfaces or lower dimensional sets).

2. If there exists a PN frame where $\vec{\mathcal{J}}=0$ everywhere then $\mathbb{H}_{ij}=\mathcal{H}_{ij}=0$ everywhere, and so $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}=0$ everywhere. Example: system of $N$ point masses; if there exists a PN frame where they are all at rest then $\mathbb{H}_{ij}=\mathcal{H}_{ij}=0$ and $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}=0$ everywhere, cf. Eq. (92) below.

3. Observation 2 is guaranteed *only* for PN frames, where (87) holds. For arbitrary frames, the vorticity and shear/expansion of the observer congruence can be arbitrarily large; the terms involving them in (82)-(83) can no longer be neglected, and act as sources for $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha\beta}$. Example: gravitational field generated by a spinning body; in the frame co-rotating with the body there are no mass-currents ($\vec{\mathcal{J}}=0$), but, in spite of that, $\mathrm{curl}\mathcal{H}_{\hat{i}\hat{j}}\neq 0$ and $\nabla^{\perp}_{\hat{j}}\mathcal{H}^{\hat{j}}_{\ \ \hat{i}}\neq 0$ generically, implying $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha\beta}=\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}\neq 0$ and *also* $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}\neq 0$ generically.

4. The converse of 2 is not true: when there is no PN frame where $\vec{\mathcal{J}}=0$ everywhere, that does not necessarily mean that $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}\neq 0$ or that $\mathbb{H}_{ij}$ cannot vanish in some region with respect to some frame. Examples: the 2-body system of Sec. V B, or the spinning body of Sec. V C: although there are no PN frames where both bodies are/the whole body is at rest, still $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}=0$ in the orbital/equatorial plane, and $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}=\mathcal{H}_{\alpha\beta}=0$ with respect to certain observer congruences that *do not* correspond to PN frames.

Point 1 is the statement that either $\nabla_j\mathcal{H}^{j}_{\ \ i}\neq 0$ or $\mathrm{curl}\mathcal{H}_{ij}\neq 0$ imply that $\mathcal{H}_{ij}$ cannot vanish in an open 3-D spatial set. Point 2 follows directly from Eqs. (87)-(88); one may check also that it is consistent with Eqs. (89)-(90) by noting that, when $\vec{\mathcal{J}}=0$ everywhere *in a PN frame*, $[\dot{\mathcal{E}}_{ij}]_{\rm N}=0$, cf. Eqs. (88), so that indeed $\mathrm{curl}\mathcal{H}_{ij}=\partial_j\mathcal{H}^{j}_{\ \ i}=0$.

Regarding point 3 one observes that, for arbitrary frames the different terms involving $\sigma_{\alpha\beta}$, $\theta$, $\omega^\alpha$ and $a^\alpha$ in Eqs. (82)-(83) cannot in general be neglected. It follows that when $\vec{\mathcal{J}}=0$, one can still have $\mathrm{curl}\mathcal{H}_{ij}\neq 0$ and/or $\nabla^{\perp}_{\hat{j}}\mathcal{H}^{\hat{j}}_{\ \ \hat{i}}\neq 0$, implying $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha\beta}\neq 0\Rightarrow\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}\neq 0$ in any open 3-D spatial set. In general this will also imply $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}\neq 0$. In the case of the stationary gravitational field of a spinning body, from the point of view of the frame rigidly co-rotating[14] with it there are no mass-currents, $\vec{\mathcal{J}}=0$; moreover $\sigma_{\alpha\beta}=\theta=0$ (since the frame is rigid), $\dot{\mathcal{E}}_{\hat{i}\hat{j}}=\dot{\pi}_{\hat{i}\hat{j}}=0$ (since the setup is stationary in this frame), and, outside the body, $\rho=p=\pi_{ij}=0$. But still $\mathrm{curl}\mathcal{H}_{\hat{i}\hat{j}}=\omega^{\hat{m}}\epsilon_{\hat{l}\hat{k}(\hat{i}}\mathcal{E}^{\hat{k}}_{\ \ \hat{j})}-2a^{\hat{k}}\epsilon_{\hat{k}\hat{m}(\hat{i}}\mathcal{H}^{\hat{m}}_{\ \ \hat{j})}$ and $\nabla^{\perp}_{\hat{j}}\mathcal{H}^{\hat{j}}_{\ \ \hat{i}}=-3\omega^{\hat{j}}\mathcal{E}_{\hat{i}\hat{j}}$, which are generically non-zero, implying $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha\beta}=\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}\neq 0$ and also $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}\neq 0$ generically, as we shall see explicitly in Sec. V C (Eq. (107) therein).

Regarding point 4 it is also worth mentioning that it is possible, even in a region where $\vec{\mathcal{J}}\neq 0$, to have $\star\mathbf{C}\cdot\mathbf{C}=0$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha\beta}=0$ with respect to some observers; an example is the Van Stockum interior solution, corresponding to an infinitely long and rigidly rotating cylinder of dust; it is shown in [81] that there is a region within the cylinder (the inner cylinder $r<(2a)^{-1}$, in the notation therein) where there are observers for whom $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha\beta}=0$, in analogy with the situation for the magnetic field within a rotating charged cylinder discussed in Sec. IV D. This is consistent with Eqs. (82)-(83), as in a region where $\vec{\mathcal{J}}\neq 0$ we can still have (depending on the kinematical quantities of the chosen frame) $\mathrm{curl}\mathcal{H}_{\hat{i}\hat{j}}=\nabla^{\perp}_{\hat{j}}\mathcal{H}^{\hat{j}}_{\ \ \hat{i}}=0$. The same does not apply however to $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$, which is *always* non-zero when $\vec{\mathcal{J}}\neq 0$ by virtue of Eq. (84).

*Systems of N point masses.*— Systems of point masses are of special interest in this work; for such systems the metric potentials read, in the *harmonic gauge* (e.g. [18,

[14] The associated coordinate system is obtained from the Boyer Lindquist coordinates by the simple transformation $\phi'=\phi+\Omega t$, $\Omega\equiv$ body's angular velocity.

31, 69, 77]),

$$w = \sum_{\rm a} \frac{M_{\rm a}}{r_{\rm a}} \left( 1 + 2v_{\rm a}^2 - \sum_{\rm b\neq a} \frac{M_{\rm b}}{r_{\rm ab}} - \frac{1}{2}\vec{r}_{\rm a}\cdot\vec{a}_{\rm a} - \frac{(\vec{r}_{\rm a}\cdot\vec{v}_{\rm a})^2}{2r_{\rm a}^2} \right)$$
$$\vec{\mathcal{A}} = -4\sum_{\rm a} \frac{M_{\rm a}}{r_{\rm a}}\vec{v}_{\rm a} \; ; \qquad U = \sum_{\rm a} \frac{M_{\rm a}}{r_{\rm a}} \; , \tag{91}$$

where $M_{\rm a}$ is the mass of particle "a", $\vec{r}_{\rm a}$, $\vec{r}_{\rm ab}$ and $\vec{v}_{\rm a}$ are defined in Sec. IV (after Eq. (65)), and $\vec{a}_{\rm a} = \partial\vec{v}_{\rm a}/\partial t$ is the *coordinate* acceleration. For a system of gravitating bodies (with no external forces), to 1PN accuracy, $\vec{a}_{\rm a}$ is to be taken above as the Newtonian field caused by the other bodies, i.e., $\vec{a}_{\rm a} = -\sum_{\rm b\neq a} M_{\rm b}\vec{r}_{\rm ab}/r_{\rm ab}^3$.

Observe that $\mathcal{A}_i$ and $U$, and hence $\mathbb{H}_{ij}$, are *linear*, i.e., they are a superposition of the contribution of each source [31], just like the electromagnetic potentials and fields. One can write (87) explicitly in the suggestive forms

$$\mathbb{H}_{ij} \;=\; 6\sum_{\rm a} \frac{M_{\rm a}}{r_{\rm a}^5}(\vec{r}_{\rm a}\times\vec{v}_{\rm a})_{(i}(r_{\rm a})_{j)} \tag{92}$$
$$\Leftrightarrow \overleftrightarrow{\mathbb{H}} \;=\; \sum_{\rm a}\left(\vec{v}_{\rm a}\times\left[\overleftrightarrow{\mathbb{E}_{\rm a}}\right]_{\rm N} - \left[\overleftrightarrow{\mathbb{E}_{\rm a}}\right]_{\rm N}\times\vec{v}_{\rm a}\right) \; , \tag{93}$$

where $\left[\mathbb{E}_{\rm a}^{ij}\right]_{\rm N}$ denotes the Newtonian tidal tensor of particle "a", and we used the dyadic notation in point 4 of Sec. I A. Notice the formal analogy with the post-Coulombian expression for the magnetic field (67). This will allow us to understand the structure of the curvature invariants of the relevant gravitational setups by a reasoning analogous to that in the corresponding electromagnetic setups.

### A. One single point mass

Drawing a parallel with Sec. IV, we will start by studying the invariants of the gravitational field produced by a single point mass. This is the gravitational field effectively involved in the translational form of gravitomagnetism detected in the observations of the binary system[15] PSR 1913 +16 (the Hulse-Taylor binary pulsar) [3]. It also describes the relevant contribution to the geodetic precession measured in different systems: the precession of the Earth-Moon system along its orbit around the Sun, detected in the analysis of Lunar Laser Ranging (LLR) data [10–12], the geodetic precession of the gyroscopes in the Gravity Probe-B [13], and the precession of the pulsar's spin vector in the binary systems PSR J0737−3039A/B [14] and PSR B1534+12 [15].

[15] Even though the binary system is a two-body system, the effect being measured is the influence of the translational gravitomagnetic field produced by one body (playing the role of the source) on the motion of the other body. Hence, in what pertains to this effect, the system may effectively be regarded as a one-body (the source) system, the other body being the test particle.

The metric is described by the Schwarzschild solution, which reads, in Schwarzschild coordinates,

$$ds^2 = -\left(1-\frac{2M}{r}\right)dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{\left(1-\frac{2M}{r}\right)} + r^2 d\Omega^2 \; .$$

The observers at rest in this coordinate system are the Killing or *"static"* observers $\mathbf{u} \propto \partial/\partial t$, which may be thought of as rigidly attached to the asymptotic inertial rest frame of the source.

This spacetime is of Petrov type D (everywhere); thus the third condition in (35) is satisfied everywhere, and one only has to worry about the quadratic invariants, which have the structure:

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}}{8} = \mathbb{E}^{\alpha\gamma}\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\gamma} - \mathbb{H}^{\alpha\gamma}\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\gamma} = \dfrac{6M^2}{r^6} > 0 \\ \dfrac{\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}}{16} = \mathbb{E}^{\alpha\gamma}\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\gamma} = 0 \;\; \text{(everywhere)} \end{cases} .$$

Thus this is (everywhere) a purely electric spacetime, i.e., everywhere there are observers for which $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta} = 0$, cf. Sec. III A. As we have seen there and in Fig. 2, such observers are precisely those with 4-velocity lying in the time-like plane spanned by the two principal null directions (PNDs). For this spacetime, the PNDs are generated by null vectors (cf. e.g. [76], p. 902)

$$k_+^\alpha = \left(\frac{r}{r-2M}, 1, 0, 0\right) \qquad k_-^\alpha = \left(\frac{r}{r-2M}, -1, 0, 0\right) \; .$$

From $k_+^\alpha$ and $k_-^\alpha$ one can construct two linearly independent vectors: a time-like vector $\tau^\alpha = k_+^\alpha + k_-^\alpha \propto \partial/\partial t$, which has zero radial component and (up to a normalization factor) coincides with the 4-velocity of the static observers, and a radial space-like vector $R^\alpha = k_+^\alpha - k_-^\alpha \propto \partial/\partial r$. They are related to diagram 2 by identifying $\tau^\alpha$ with a vector parallel to $t^\alpha$, and noting that $e^\alpha = R^\alpha/|R^\alpha|$. These vectors span the PND plane; hence, $\mathbb{H}'_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ for any time-like vector $u'^\alpha$ which is a linear combination of $\tau^\alpha$ and $R^\alpha$. That is,

$$u'^\alpha = (u'^0, u'^r, 0, 0) \; ,$$

corresponding to *static* observers, or to observers in radial motion, in analogy with the situation in the analogous electromagnetic system of Sec. IV A. One might check these results by computing explicitly $\mathbb{H}'_{\alpha\beta}$ for an arbitrary $u'^\alpha$, as done in [58]. Note that the fact that $\mathbb{H}'_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ for the static observers means that it *globally vanishes in a rigid frame.*

One can also get intuition on why $\mathbb{E}^{\alpha\gamma}\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\gamma}$ remains zero for any observer from arguments analogous to those that explain why $E^\alpha B_\alpha = 0$ for the point charge; namely the formal similarity between the transformation laws. Let $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$ and $\mathcal{O}'(\mathbf{u}')$ be, respectively, a static observer and an observer moving relative to it with some velocity $\vec{v}$. For $\mathcal{O}(\mathbf{u})$, $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta} = 0 \Rightarrow \mathbb{E}^{\alpha\gamma}\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\gamma} = 0$. The moving observer $\mathcal{O}'(\mathbf{u}')$ will in turn measure a non-vanishing gravitomagnetic tidal tensor, $\mathbb{H}'_{\alpha\beta} \neq 0$, but it will be such that it is

always orthogonal to the gravitoelectric tidal tensor $\mathbb{E}'_{\alpha\beta}$, in analogy with the situation for the magnetic field (69). In order to see this, first observe, from the decompositions (20)-(21), that with respect to the congruence of static observers ($u^\alpha = u^0\delta^\alpha_0$), the Riemann tensor and its dual are completely described by the electric part:

$$R_{\alpha\beta}{}^{\gamma\delta} = 4\left\{2u_{[\alpha}u^{[\gamma} + g_{[\alpha}{}^{[\gamma}\right\}\mathbb{E}_{\beta]}{}^{\delta]} ;$$
$$\star R_{\alpha\beta}{}^{\gamma\delta} = 2\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\lambda\tau}\mathbb{E}^{\lambda[\gamma}u^{\delta]}u^\tau + 2\epsilon^{\lambda\tau\gamma\delta}\mathbb{E}_{\lambda[\alpha}u_{\beta]}u_\tau .$$

Hence, to linear order, the space components of $\mathbb{E}'_{\alpha\beta} \equiv R_{\alpha\mu\beta\nu}u'^\mu u'^\nu$ and $\mathbb{H}'_{\alpha\beta} \equiv \star R_{\alpha\mu\beta\nu}u'^\mu u'^\nu$ read (using dyadic notation, see point 4 of Sec. I A),

$$\overleftrightarrow{\mathbb{E}}' \simeq \overleftrightarrow{\mathbb{E}}; \qquad \overleftrightarrow{\mathbb{H}}' \simeq \overleftrightarrow{\mathbb{E}} \times \vec{v} - \vec{v} \times \overleftrightarrow{\mathbb{E}} , \qquad (94)$$

which have formal similarities with Eqs. (69)-(70), and, together with $\mathbb{H}'_{0\alpha} = \mathbb{H}'_{\alpha 0} = 0$, lead immediately to $\mathbb{E}'^{\alpha\beta}\mathbb{H}'_{\alpha\beta} = \mathbb{E}'^{ij}\mathbb{H}'_{ij} = 0$. The verification using the exact expressions for $\mathbb{E}'_{\alpha\beta}$, $\mathbb{H}'_{\alpha\beta}$ is also straightforward.

### B. Two bodies, coplanar motion — the Earth-Sun system

We consider here the gravitational field generated by two bodies — the Earth and the Sun — orbiting each other, whose (translational) gravitomagnetic effects are implied in [17, 18, 22]. The metric, accurate to first post-Newtonian order, is, cf. Eqs. (85) and (91),

$$g_{00} = -1 + 2\frac{M_\oplus}{r_\oplus} + 4\frac{M_\oplus v_\oplus^2}{r_\oplus} - \frac{M_\oplus(\vec{v}_\oplus\cdot\vec{r}_\oplus)^2}{r_\oplus^3} - \frac{2M_\oplus M_\odot}{r_{\odot\oplus}r_\oplus}$$
$$- \frac{M_\oplus}{r_\oplus}\vec{r}_\oplus\cdot\vec{a}_\oplus + \odot\leftrightarrow\oplus - 2\left(\frac{M_\odot}{r_\odot} + \frac{M_\oplus}{r_\oplus}\right)^2 ; \qquad (95)$$

$$g_{0i} = 4\left[\frac{M_\odot(v_\odot)_i}{r_\odot} + \frac{M_\oplus(v_\oplus)_i}{r_\oplus}\right] ; \qquad (96)$$

$$g_{ij} = \left[1 + 2\left(\frac{M_\odot}{r_\odot} + \frac{M_\oplus}{r_\oplus}\right)\right]\delta_{ij} , \qquad (97)$$

where $\odot \equiv$ Sun, $\oplus \equiv$ Earth. Since $\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta} \sim O(\epsilon^2/L^2)$ and $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta} \sim O(\epsilon^3/L^2)$, cf. Eqs. (86)-(87), then, generically $\mathbb{E}^{\alpha\gamma}\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\gamma} > \mathbb{H}^{\alpha\gamma}\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\gamma}$, i.e., $\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} > 0$. In this respect we note that the region of magnetic dominance that exists between the two charges in the electromagnetic system of Sec. IV B (around the point where $\vec{E} = 0$), has no counterpart in the present gravitational system, because here we are dealing with *tidal tensors*, not vector fields, and these add differently. Namely, in the region corresponding to that where, in the electromagnetic system, the electric fields cancel out, the tidal tensors $\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta}$ of each body *add up* instead (in electromagnetism this is analogous instead to the situation with the electric *tidal tensor*, as defined in [33, 34]). As for the Chern-Pontryagin invariant $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} = 16\mathbb{E}^{\alpha\beta}\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$, one has, to lowest order, cf. Eqs. (86)-(87), (91)-(92),




Figure 6: The Earth-Sun system. Observers $\mathcal{O}'(\mathbf{u}')$ for which $\mathbb{H}'_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ (represented only along the Earth-Sun axis); their velocity $\vec{v}$ is depicted by dashed arrows.

$$\mathbb{E}^{\alpha\beta}\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta} = U^{,ij}\left(\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_i{}^{lk}\mathcal{A}_{k,lj} + \epsilon_{ij}{}^k\dot{U}_{,k}\right) + O(\epsilon^7/L^2)$$
$$= 6\left(\sum_{\mathrm{a}=\oplus,\odot}\frac{M_\mathrm{a}}{r_\mathrm{a}}\right)^{,ij}\sum_{\mathrm{a}=\oplus,\odot}\frac{M_\mathrm{a}}{r_\mathrm{a}^5}(\vec{r}_\mathrm{a}\times\vec{v}_\mathrm{a})_{(i}(r_\mathrm{a})_{j)}$$
$$= \frac{18M_\oplus M_\odot}{r_\oplus^5 r_\odot^5}(\vec{r}_\oplus\cdot\vec{r}_\odot)\left[(\vec{v}_\oplus\times\vec{r}_\oplus)\cdot\vec{r}_\odot + (\vec{v}_\odot\times\vec{r}_\odot)\cdot\vec{r}_\oplus\right] , \qquad (98)$$

which agrees[16] with Eq. (7) of [1]. This invariant (namely the expressions between square brackets) exhibits formal similarities with the electromagnetic invariant (74); it has the structure

$$\mathbb{E}^{\alpha\gamma}\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\gamma}\begin{cases} = 0 & \text{in the orbital plane;} \\ \neq 0 & \text{generically.}\end{cases}$$

That $\mathbb{E}^{\alpha\beta}\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ in the orbital plane $\Sigma$ can be seen observing that, when the point of observation $P$ lies on $\Sigma$, then $\{\vec{r}_\odot, \vec{r}_\oplus\} \in \Sigma$; and since also $\{\vec{v}_\odot, \vec{v}_\oplus\} \in \Sigma$ (always), it follows that $(\vec{v}_\oplus\times\vec{r}_\oplus)\cdot\vec{r}_\odot = (\vec{v}_\odot\times\vec{r}_\odot)\cdot\vec{r}_\oplus = 0$, implying $\mathbb{E}^{\alpha\beta}\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta} = 0$. This structure is analogous to that of (74) for coplanar motion, except that here the factor $(\vec{r}_\oplus\cdot\vec{r}_\odot)$, which has no electromagnetic counterpart, introduces an additional 1-D region where $\mathbb{E}^{\alpha\beta}\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ (the circle determined by $\vec{r}_\oplus \perp \vec{r}_\odot$). The existence of observers for which $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ on $\Sigma$ can also be understood in analogy with the electromagnetic apparatus of Sec. IV B. Let us compute their velocities. The gravitomagnetic tidal tensor measured by an observer $\mathcal{O}'$ moving with velocity $\vec{v}$ with respect to the chosen PN frame is, cf. Eq. (92),

$$\mathbb{H}'_{ij} = 6\left[\frac{M_\oplus}{r_\oplus^5}(\vec{r}_\oplus\times[\vec{v}_\oplus - \vec{v}])_{(i}(r_\oplus)_{j)} + \oplus\leftrightarrow\odot\right] . \qquad (99)$$

Choose, for convenience, the PN frame comoving with the center of mass (CM) of the Earth-Sun system (which

[16] To obtain Eq. (7) of [1] from Eq. (98) above, one makes $\vec{v}_\odot = 0$ (as in [1] an heliocentric reference frame is used), and notes that $\vec{r}_\odot$ and $\vec{r}_\oplus$ read, in the notation therein, respectively, $\vec{x}_M$ and $\vec{r}_{M\oplus}$.

is close to the "barycentric" reference frame considered in e.g. [16–18], or to the heliocentric system in [1]), and take $z = 0$ to be the orbital plane $\Sigma$. Firstly one observes that, in order for $\mathbb{H}'_{ij} = 0$, the observer's velocity $\vec{v}$ must be parallel to $\Sigma$, except at some special points on $\Sigma$,[17] in analogy with the electromagnetic problem in Sec. IV B (coplanar motion). This implies $\vec{r}_\oplus \times [\vec{v}_\oplus - \vec{v}] = (\vec{r}_\oplus \times [\vec{v}_\oplus - \vec{v}])^z \vec{e}_z$, and thus trivially $\mathbb{H}'_{ii} = 0$, $\mathbb{H}'_{xy} = \mathbb{H}'_{yx} = 0$. The only surviving components are $\mathbb{H}'_{xz} = \mathbb{H}'_{zx}$ and $\mathbb{H}'_{yz} = \mathbb{H}'_{zy}$, whose vanishing amounts to the conditions

$$\vec{v} \times \vec{a}^{(i)} = \vec{b}^{(i)}, \qquad i = x,\, y, \tag{100}$$

where the vectors $\vec{a}^{(i)}$ and $\vec{b}^{(i)}$ are defined by

$$\vec{a}^{(i)} \equiv \frac{r^i_\oplus M_\oplus}{r^5_\oplus}\vec{r}_\oplus + \frac{r^i_\odot M_\odot}{r^5_\odot}\vec{r}_\odot,$$
$$\vec{b}^{(i)} \equiv \frac{r^i_\oplus M_\oplus}{r^5_\oplus}\vec{v}_\oplus \times \vec{r}_\oplus + \frac{r^i_\odot M_\odot}{r^5_\odot}\vec{v}_\odot \times \vec{r}_\odot \ .$$

Since $(\vec{r}_\oplus \times \vec{r}_\odot) = (\vec{r}_\oplus \times \vec{r}_\odot)^z \vec{e}_z$, we have

$$\vec{a}^{(x)} \times \vec{a}^{(y)} = \frac{M_\oplus M_\odot}{r^5_\oplus r^5_\odot}\|\vec{r}_\oplus \times \vec{r}_\odot\|^2 \vec{e}_z \ , \tag{101}$$

and the solution of (100) splits into two cases:

*1. Observer off Earth-Sun axis ($\vec{r}_\oplus \times \vec{r}_\odot \neq 0$).* By (101) $\vec{a}^{(x)}$ and $\vec{a}^{(y)}$ span in this case the orbital plane, therefore one may write $\vec{v} = \lambda \vec{a}^{(x)} + \mu \vec{a}^{(y)}$; substituting into (100) and using (101) readily gives the unique solution

$$\vec{v} = \frac{r^5_\oplus r^5_\odot}{M_\oplus M_\odot ||\vec{r}_\oplus \times \vec{r}_\odot||^2}\left((b^{(y)})^z \vec{a}^{(x)} - (b^{(x)})^z \vec{a}^{(y)}\right), \tag{102}$$

where $(b^{(i)})^z = \vec{b}^{(i)} \cdot \vec{e}_z$. Hence, at each point of $\Sigma$ off the Earth-Sun axis, there is a *unique* observer moving parallel to $\Sigma$ for which $\mathbb{H}'_{\alpha\beta} = 0$. This is in contrast with the electromagnetic analogue in Sec. IV B (coplanar motion), where the velocity of the observers measuring $\vec{B}' = 0$ had an arbitrary component along the electric field (hence there was an infinite number of such observers at each point). One can say that the situation is similar (in this respect) to purely electric exact solutions of the general Petrov type I.

[17] If $\vec{v}$ has a component orthogonal to $\Sigma$, then, taking the $x$-axis along the Earth-Sun axis, such that $r^y_\odot = r^y_\oplus$ and $r^x_\odot = r^x_\oplus + r_{\odot\oplus}$, one obtains from the conditions $\mathbb{H}'_{xy} = \mathbb{H}'_{xx} = 0$ a system of two equations in two unknowns $r^x_\oplus$ and $r^y_\oplus$, namely $M_\oplus((r^x_\oplus)^2 - (r^y_\oplus)^2)/r^5_\oplus + M_\odot((r^x_\odot)^2 - (r^y_\oplus)^2)/r^5_\odot = 0$ and $M_\oplus r^x_\oplus/r^5_\oplus + M_\odot r^x_\odot/r^5_\odot = 0$. With $M_\odot \gg M_\oplus$ this system has two solutions, corresponding to two points in $\Sigma$ very close to the Earth and off the Earth-Sun axis. An observer $\mathcal{O}'$ at those points measures $\mathbb{H}'_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ precisely if the component of its velocity parallel to $\Sigma$ equals (102), the component orthogonal to $\Sigma$ being arbitrary.

*2. Observer on Earth-Sun axis ($\vec{r}_\oplus \times \vec{r}_\odot = 0$)*, depicted in Fig. 6. In this case $\vec{a}^{(x)}/r^x_\oplus = \vec{a}^{(y)}/r^y_\oplus \equiv \vec{V}$ and $\vec{b}^{(x)}/r^x_\oplus = \vec{b}^{(y)}/r^y_\oplus \equiv \vec{W}$, such that (100) reduces to the single equation $\vec{v} \times \vec{V} = \vec{W}$. Clearly, the component $\vec{v}_{\|V}$ of $\vec{v}$ parallel to $\vec{V}$ is arbitrary; for the orthogonal component one obtains (taking a cross product with $\vec{V}$):

$$\vec{v}_{\perp V} \equiv \vec{v}_{\perp r_{\odot\oplus}} = \frac{\vec{V} \times \vec{W}}{V^2} \simeq \frac{M_\oplus(r^3_\odot - r^3_\oplus)}{r^3_\odot M_\oplus + M_\odot r^3_\oplus}\vec{v}_\oplus \ ; \tag{103}$$

where we noted that $\vec{V}$ is parallel to the Earth-Sun axis ($\vec{V} \parallel \vec{r}_{\odot\oplus}$, where $\vec{r}_{\odot\oplus} \equiv \vec{r}_\odot - \vec{r}_\oplus = \vec{x}_\oplus - \vec{x}_\odot$), and the last approximate equality follows from the fact that, along the axis, $\vec{V} \cdot \vec{v}_\oplus = \vec{V} \cdot \vec{v}_\odot = 0$, and that $M_\oplus \vec{v}_\oplus \simeq -M_\odot \vec{v}_\odot$ (since the system's momentum vanishes in the CM frame). We note moreover that, along the axis, the super-Poynting vector as measured by the rest observers, $\mathcal{P}^i = \epsilon^i{}_{jk}\mathbb{E}^{jl}\mathbb{H}_l{}^k$, reads

$$\vec{\mathcal{P}} = 9\left[\frac{M^2_\oplus}{r^6_\oplus}\vec{v}_\oplus + \frac{M^2_\odot}{r^6_\odot}\vec{v}_\odot + \frac{M_\odot M_\oplus}{r^3_\odot r^3_\oplus}(\vec{v}_\odot + \vec{v}_\oplus)\right]$$
$$\simeq 9M_\oplus\left[\frac{M_\oplus}{r^6_\oplus} - \frac{M_\odot}{r^6_\odot} + \frac{M_\odot}{r^3_\odot r^3_\oplus} - \frac{M_\oplus}{r^3_\odot r^3_\oplus}\right]\vec{v}_\oplus \ ,$$

which is parallel to $\vec{v}_{\perp r_{\odot\oplus}}$. This means that $\vec{v}_{\perp r_{\odot\oplus}}$ is in fact the component of $\vec{v}$ parallel to $\vec{\mathcal{P}}$; therefore, along the axis, the situation is similar to a purely electric Petrov type D exact solution (and to the electromagnetic case): at each point a class of observers exists for which $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta} = 0$; such observers have a velocity consisting of a component $\vec{v}_{\|\mathcal{P}} = \vec{v}_{\perp r_{\odot\oplus}}$ along $\vec{\mathcal{P}}$ fixed by Eq. (103), plus an arbitrary component $\vec{v}_{\|r_{\oplus\odot}}$ parallel to the Earth-Sun axis.

Using $M_\odot \gg M_\oplus$ we have $x_\odot \approx 0$; considering moreover an observation point much farther than the Earth-Sun distance ($r \gg r_{\odot\oplus}$), as depicted in Fig. 6, we obtain, in the special case where $\vec{v}$ has no component along the axis ($\vec{v} = \vec{v}_{\perp r_{\odot\oplus}} = \vec{v}_{\|\mathcal{P}}$), the limit

$$v \overset{r \gg r_{\odot\oplus}}{\simeq} \frac{3M_\oplus v_\oplus r_{\odot\oplus}}{M_\odot r} = \frac{3J}{M_\odot r} \ , \tag{104}$$

where we noted that, to lowest order (which is the accuracy needed for $\vec{v}$ in Eq. (99)), $J = M_\oplus v_\oplus r_{\odot\oplus}$ is the system's angular momentum as measured in the center of mass PN frame. This is analogous to the situation in the electromagnetic problem of Sec. IV B, and the velocity field (77). The analogy can be made even closer by considering the gravitational counterpart of the system in Fig. 4, i.e., two particles with the same mass $M_1 = M_2 = M_{\rm tot}/2$ and with velocities $\vec{v}_1$ and $-\vec{v}_1$, orbiting each other (no "rod" is necessary in this case) in a circular motion of radius $d$. The velocities of the observers $\mathcal{O}'$ (at points $P$ along the axis) for which $\mathbb{H}'_{ij} = 0$ are obtained from (103) setting $M_\oplus = M_\odot = M_{\rm tot}/2$, $|\vec{x}_\oplus| = |\vec{x}_\odot| = d$, $v_\oplus = v_1$, leading to

$$v = v_1 \frac{(3dr^2 + d^3)}{r^3 + 3d^2 r} \overset{r \gg d}{\simeq} \frac{3v_1 d}{r} = \frac{3J}{M_{\rm tot} r} \ , \tag{105}$$

where, again, we identified $J = v_1 M_{\rm tot} d$. This is similar (up to a factor 3/2), for large $r$, to the velocity (77) for which $\vec{B}' = 0$ in the electromagnetic system. The reason why $\mathbb{H}'_{ij} = 0$ for these observers (and not for others) can also be understood by a reasoning analogous to the one we made at the end of Sec. IV B: $\mathbb{H}_{ij}$ is the superposition of the individual gravitomagnetic tidal tensors produced by each body, cf. Eq. (99), which, for the setup analogous to Fig. IV B, has non-vanishing components $\mathbb{H}_{zy} = \mathbb{H}_{yz} = (\mathbb{H}_1)_{zy} + (\mathbb{H}_2)_{zy}$. The contributions $(\mathbb{H}_1)_{zy}$ and $(\mathbb{H}_2)_{zy}$ have opposite signs since $v_1^x = -v_2^x$. Thus, for an observer at rest in the system's CM frame ($v = 0$), $|(\mathbb{H}_2)_{zy}| > |(\mathbb{H}_1)_{zy}|$, since body 2 is closer to the observer. Increasing the observer's velocity $v$ (in the sense of the orbital motion) means decreasing $|(\mathbb{H}'_2)_{zy}|$ whilst increasing $|(\mathbb{H}'_1)_{zy}|$, so that they eventually cancel out, $\mathbb{H}'_{ij} = 0$. These similarities with electromagnetism can be traced back to the facts that, to first post-Newtonian order, $\mathbb{H}_{ij}$, Eq. (92), is linear (so a superposition principle applies just like in electromagnetism), and has a dependence on the velocities of the sources (and transformation laws under a change of PN frame, Eq. (94)) that are, to some extent, also analogous to their electromagnetic counterparts.

Finally, we note that this application exemplifies point 4 of Sec. V: although there is no PN frame where *both* bodies are at rest, still $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} = 0$ in a 2-D region (the orbital plane), where $\mathbb{H}'_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ for certain families of observers (which do not form PN frames).

### C. The gravitational field of a spinning body

The gravitational field of a compact, spinning body of mass $M$ and angular momentum $J$, whose center of mass is at rest in the given PN frame is, to 1PN order, obtained by substituting $w = U = M/r$, $\vec{\mathcal{A}} = 2\vec{r}\times\vec{J}/r^3$ into Eqs. (85), see e.g. [69, 77]. This coincides with the 1PN limit of the Kerr solution (in isotropic coordinates), which is the field we shall consider here, since this is an exact solution well suited to our methods. Its well-known form in Boyer-Lindquist coordinates is

$$\begin{aligned} ds^2 \;=\; & -\frac{\Delta}{\Sigma}\left(dt - a\sin^2\theta d\phi\right)^2 + \frac{\Sigma}{\Delta}dr^2 + \Sigma d\theta^2 \\ & + \frac{\sin^2\theta}{\Sigma}\left(adt - (r^2+a^2)d\phi\right)^2 \;, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Delta \equiv r^2 - 2Mr + a^2 \;,\quad \Sigma \equiv r^2 + a^2\cos^2\theta \;,\quad a \equiv \frac{J}{M} \;.$$

This spacetime is of Petrov type D, so the third condition in (35) is satisfied everywhere, and one only needs to worry about the quadratic invariants; they read [40, 84, 85]




Figure 7: Structure of the quadratic invariants $\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}$ and $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}$ in the Kerr spacetime, in Boyer-Lindquist coordinates. Only the half-plane $\theta \leq \pi/2$ is represented. Regions of electric dominance ($\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} > 0$) are colored in dotted blue, regions of magnetic dominance ($\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} < 0$) are colored in stripped yellow. Dashed blue circles represent the zeros of $\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}$, solid red lines (two circles plus the $\theta = \pi/2$ axis) represent the zeros of $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} &= \frac{48M^2}{\Sigma^6}(r^2 - a^2\cos^2\theta)(\Sigma^2 - 16r^2a^2\cos^2\theta) \;; \\ \star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} &= \frac{96M^2ra}{\Sigma^6}(3r^2 - a^2\cos^2\theta)(r^2 - 3a^2\cos^2\theta)\cos\theta \;. \end{aligned} \tag{106}$$

The structure of these invariants is graphed in Fig. 7. The zeros of $\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}$ occur on the shells $r = \pm a\cos\theta$ and $r = \pm(2\pm\sqrt{3})a\cos\theta$, signaling transitions between regions of electric ($\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} > 0$) vs. magnetic ($\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} < 0$) dominance. The zeros of $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}$ define purely electric/magnetic surfaces and occur for $\theta = \pi/2$ and $r = \pm a\cos\theta/\sqrt{3}$ (purely electric) and $r = \pm\sqrt{3}a\cos\theta$ (purely magnetic). Except for the (purely electric) equatorial plane, all these surfaces lie either inside the even horizon $r_+$, or, in the case of the larger shells (given by $r = \pm(2+\sqrt{3})a\cos\theta$ when $\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} = 0$, and by $r = \pm\sqrt{3}a\cos\theta$ when $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} = 0$), they may, for large enough values of $a$, lie partly outside the horizon,[18] yet still very close to it. Hence, in the astrophysical applications under discussion, which pertain to the "post-Newtonian zone" [77], where $r \gg r_+$, we have $\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} > 0$ everywhere, and the only surface where

[18] In order to see this, one observes that, for the largest blue dashed circle in Fig. 7 (the circle $r = \pm(2+\sqrt{3})a\cos\theta$), the non-extreme condition $a/M < 1$ implies $r_{\rm max}/r_+ < 2\sqrt{3}$, where $r_{\rm max} = r_{|_{\theta=0}}$ is the maximum value of the coordinate $r$ along the circle. These regions shall be discussed in detail elsewhere.




Figure 8: Observers for which the gravitomagnetic tidal tensor $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$ vanishes; their 3-velocity $\vec{v}$ is represented by black arrows (note that these are *not* the observers rigidly corotating with the body). $\vec{e}_\phi$ is the coordinate basis vector $\vec{e}_\phi \equiv \vec{\partial}_\phi = \sqrt{g_{\phi\phi}}\vec{e}_{\hat{\phi}}$. Compare with the velocity fields in Figs. 5 and 6.

$\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} = 0$ is the (purely electric) equatorial plane:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbb{E}^{\alpha\gamma}\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\gamma} - \mathbb{H}^{\alpha\gamma}\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\gamma} = \dfrac{6M^2}{r^6} + O(\epsilon^6/L^4) > 0 \ ; \\ \mathbb{E}^{\alpha\gamma}\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\gamma} = \cos\theta\left[\dfrac{18JM}{r^7} + O(\epsilon^7/L^4)\right] \ (= 0 \ \text{ for } \theta = \dfrac{\pi}{2}), \end{cases} \tag{107}$$

which is formally analogous to the electromagnetic counterpart (79). The equatorial plane being purely electric means that there are therein observers $u'^\alpha$ for which $\mathbb{H}'_{\alpha\beta} = 0$. As discussed in Sec. III A and Fig. 2, such observers are those whose 4-velocity lies in the time-like plane spanned by the two principal null directions (PNDs), and *only these*. The PNDs are generated by null vectors (cf. e.g. [76], p. 902),

$$k^\alpha_+ = \left(\frac{r^2+a^2}{\Delta}, 1, 0, \frac{a}{\Delta}\right); \qquad k^\alpha_- = \left(\frac{r^2+a^2}{\Delta}, -1, 0, \frac{a}{\Delta}\right).$$

Analogously to Sec. V A, one constructs two linearly independent vectors: the time-like vector $\tau^\alpha = k^\alpha_+ + k^\alpha_-$ and the space-like radial vector $R^\alpha = k^\alpha_+ - k^\alpha_- \propto \partial/\partial r$. They are related to diagram 2 by identifying $\tau^\alpha \parallel t^\alpha$, $e^\alpha = R^\alpha/|R^\alpha|$. Since these vectors span the PND plane, the unit time-like vectors $u'^\alpha$ with respect to which $\mathbb{H}'_{\alpha\beta}$ vanishes are those that are a linear combination of $\tau^\alpha$ and $R^\alpha$, i.e.,

$$u'^\alpha = (u'^0, u'^r, 0, \frac{a}{a^2+r^2}u'^0) \ ,$$

corresponding to observers with angular velocity

$$\frac{d\phi}{dt} = \frac{u'^\phi}{u'^0} = \frac{a}{a^2+r^2} \tag{108}$$

and an arbitrary radial velocity $v^r = u'^r/u'^0$ (subject only to the normalization condition $u'^\alpha u'_\alpha = -1$). One could check these results by computing explicitly $\mathbb{H}'_{\alpha\beta}$ (for an arbitrary $u'^\alpha$) as done in [58]. Since $d\phi/dt = k^\phi_+/k^0_+ = k^\phi_-/k^0_-$, these observers have also the interesting property that they measure the photons of the principal null congruences to be in purely radial motion. In the special case $u^r = 0$, one obtains the observers depicted in Fig. 8, which coincide[19] with the so-called "Carter canonical observers" (e.g. [86]).

Notice the similarity with the velocity field in Fig. 5, which makes the magnetic field vanish in the analogous electromagnetic problem: both velocities depend only on $r$ and on the ratio $a \equiv J/M$, and asymptotically they match up to a factor of 2. Note also the similarities with the velocity fields (104) or (105) for which $\mathbb{H}'_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ in systems of two bodies orbiting each other: in the post-Newtonian regime, $r \gg r_+ \Rightarrow r \gg a$, and, from Eq. (108), $v \simeq a/r \equiv J/(Mr)$; hence, for large $r$, the velocities match up to a factor of three. The vanishing of $\mathbb{H}'_{\alpha\beta}$ for such observers can also be understood (in the PN regime) by the same reasoning we made in Sec. V B, by thinking about the rotating body as a set of translating elements and adding up their individual gravitomagnetic tidal tensors. This parallels what happens in electromagnetism, where the vanishing of $\vec{B}'$ for some observers in the equatorial plane of a spinning charge, Fig. 5, can be explained by the same reasoning that explains its vanishing in the motion plane of the system of two charges in Fig. 4. One thus concludes that, although very different from a system of one single point source of Sec V A, a spinning body is not, in the PN regime, substantially different from the two-body systems of Sec. V B, in what pertains to the structure of the curvature invariants (and the existence of observers for which $\mathbb{H}'_{\alpha\beta} = 0$).

Finally, we note that the velocity field in Fig. 8 provides another example of point 4 of Sec. V: although there is no PN frame where all the mass currents are zero, still $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} = 0$ in a 2-D spatial surface (the equatorial plane), where $\mathbb{H}'_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ for certain observer congruences that are *not* PN frames.

## VI. DYNAMICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE INVARIANTS. GRAVITOMAGNETISM.

In the previous sections we made use of the insight that the analogy $\{\mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{F}, \ \star\mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{F}\} \leftrightarrow \{\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}, \ \star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}\}$, between electromagnetic and gravitational invariants, gives us to interpret the structure of the latter. It is crucial, however, to realize that this is a *purely formal* analogy. For in one case one is dealing with quantities built on electromagnetic *fields* $E^\alpha$, $B^\alpha$; in the other case with gravitational *tidal tensors* $\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta}$, $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$; and these objects do not

[19] We thank O. Semerák for pointing this out to us.

play analogous dynamical roles. The fields $E^\alpha$ and $B^\alpha$ govern effects like the Lorentz force and the precession of a magnetic dipole, and have as closest gravitational counterpart the so-called gravitoelectric ($G^\alpha$) and gravitomagnetic ($H^\alpha$) *inertial* fields, governing effects like the (fictitious) inertial force that drives a particle in geodesic motion, or the "precession" of a gyroscope. The tensors $\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta}$, $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$, by contrast, govern gravitational tidal effects, such as the geodesic deviation, the spin-curvature force on a spinning particle, or the *differential* precession of spinning particles (and their electromagnetic analogues, from a physical point of view, are the *electromagnetic tidal tensors* $E_{\alpha\beta}$, $B_{\alpha\beta}$, as argued in [33, 34]). This means that the use, in some literature [1, 26, 85], of the formal analogy between the invariants to infer about effects like the (inertial) gravitomagnetic force on a test particle or gyroscope precession, is not a good *physical* guiding principle. The effects involved on both sides are different, and may actually be *opposite*, as we shall exemplify next.

It is likewise crucial to distinguish and understand the relation between the "gravitoelectromagnetic" inertial fields $G^\alpha$ and $H^\alpha$ (the ones involved in the frame-dragging effects under debate in the literature) and the electric and magnetic parts of the curvature $\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta}$, $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$, as well as the invariants they form, which we shall also discuss next.

### A. A magnetic dipole in the field of a spinning charge vs. a gyroscope in the Kerr spacetime

The equations of motion for a spinning particle with magnetic moment $\mu^\alpha$ (and no charge nor electric dipole moment) in a electromagnetic field in flat spacetime are, under the Mathisson-Pirani spin condition (e.g. [58]),

$$\frac{DP^\alpha}{d\tau} = B^{\beta\alpha}\mu_\beta\,; \quad \text{(a)} \qquad \frac{D_F S^\alpha}{d\tau} = \epsilon^\alpha{}_{\beta\gamma\delta}U^\delta\mu^\beta B^\gamma\,, \quad \text{(b)} \tag{109}$$

where $U^\alpha$, $P^\alpha$ and $S^\alpha$ are, respectively, the particle's 4-velocity, 4-momentum, and spin angular momentum 4-vector; $B^\alpha = \star F^{\alpha\beta}U_\beta$ and $B_{\alpha\beta} = \star F_{\alpha\gamma;\beta}U^\gamma$ are, respectively, the magnetic field and "magnetic tidal tensor" [33] as measured by the particle; $D/d\tau = U^\alpha\nabla_\alpha$ is the usual (Levi-Civita) covariant derivative, and $D_F/d\tau$ is the Fermi-Walker covariant derivative, which reads, for a *spatial* vector $X^\alpha$ ($X^\alpha U_\alpha = 0$),

$$\frac{D_F X^\alpha}{d\tau} = \frac{DX^\alpha}{d\tau} - X^\beta a_\beta U^\alpha\,.$$

The equations of motion for a spinning pole-dipole particle in a gravitational field are (under the same spin condition), e.g. [58],

$$\frac{DP^\alpha}{d\tau} = -\mathbb{H}^{\beta\alpha}S_\beta; \quad \text{(a)} \qquad \frac{dS^{\hat{i}}}{d\tau} = \left(\vec{S}\times\vec{\Omega}\right)^{\hat{i}}\,. \quad \text{(b)} \tag{110}$$

Equation (110a) is the spin-curvature force, which causes the particle to deviate from geodesic motion; it consists of a coupling between $S^\alpha$ and the gravitomagnetic tidal tensor as measured by the particle, $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta} = R_{\alpha\mu\beta\nu}U^\mu U^\nu$. Equation (110b) is the space part of equation $D_F S^\alpha/d\tau = 0$ as measured in the particle's center of mass frame (stating that $S^\alpha$ is Fermi-Walker transported). The use of a simple derivative in (110b) manifests the fact that, by contrast with the Larmor precession in (109b), the so-called "precession" of a gyroscope is not a covariant, *locally* measurable effect. Indeed, $S^\alpha$ is fixed with respect to a comoving, locally non-rotating system of axes (mathematically defined, precisely, as a Fermi-Walker transported frame; for this reason one says that gyroscopes define the local "compass of inertia", see e.g. [26, 61]). The quantity $\vec{\Omega}$ in Eq. (110b) is thus just the angular velocity of rotation of the spatial axes $\mathbf{e}_{\hat{i}}$ of the chosen frame relative to a locally non-rotating one. In the context of the measurement of frame-dragging, the triad $\mathbf{e}_{\hat{i}}$ is chosen to be rotationally locked to the "distant stars" (how such frame is constructed is discussed in Sec. VI C below); in such case $\vec{\Omega}$ yields *minus* the precession rate of the gyroscope with respect to the distant stars.

If the invariant conditions

$$\star\,\mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{F} = 0, \qquad \mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{F} > 0 \tag{111}$$

are satisfied in some region, then there are observers for which $B^\alpha = 0$ everywhere, which by Eq. (109b) means that magnetic dipoles carried by such observers do not undergo Larmor precession. But it tells us nothing, a priori, about the force on the particle. By contrast, what the conditions

$$\star\,\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} = 0, \qquad \mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} > 0 \tag{112}$$

*together with* (35) tell us (in vacuum) is that there are observers for which $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta} = 0$, which by Eq. (110a) means that gyroscopes comoving with them feel no gravitational *force*. It does not tell us (in general) about gyroscope precession. Hence the effects at stake are different; for seemingly analogous setups they may even be *opposite*.

A realization of this contrast is summarized in Table I: we have seen in Sec. IV C that, in the equatorial plane of the spinning charge, conditions (111) are satisfied, implying that observers with angular velocity (80) measure no magnetic field. Hence magnetic dipoles comoving with them do not undergo Larmor precession; they feel however a force, Eq. (109a), since $B_{\alpha\beta} \neq 0$ *always* for an observer moving in a non-uniform field (due to the laws of electromagnetic induction) as discussed in detail in [58]. We have also seen in Sec. V C that, in the equatorial plane of the spacetime around a spinning body, conditions (112) and (35), are satisfied, implying that $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ for observers with angular velocity (108). This velocity field has some similarities with (80); namely their asymptotic limits match up to a factor of two. However, for gyroscopes moving with these velocities, the situation is precisely the opposite: by Eq. (110a), no force is

Table I: Opposite effects: magnetic dipoles in the equatorial plane of a spinning charge (where $\star\mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{F}=0$, $\mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{F}>0$) vs gyroscopes in the equatorial plane of a spinning celestial body (where $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}=0$, $\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}>0$).

| Magnetic dipole moving with angular velocity | Gyroscope moving with angular velocity |
|---|---|
| $\frac{d\phi}{dt}\equiv\frac{a}{2r^2}$ (Fig. 5) | $\frac{d\phi}{dt}=\frac{a}{a^2+r^2}$ (Fig. 8) |
| No Larmor precession: $\vec{B}=0\Rightarrow\frac{D\vec{S}}{dt}=0$ | Gyroscope precesses: $\frac{d\vec{S}}{dt}\neq 0$ |
| A force acts on it: $B_{\alpha\beta}\neq 0\Rightarrow\frac{DP^\alpha}{d\tau}\neq 0$ | No force: $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}=0\Rightarrow\frac{DP^\alpha}{d\tau}=0$ |

exerted on them, but they *precess* (with respect to the distant stars). This last point deserves to be discussed in detail. To first post-Newtonian order, in terms of the metric potentials in (85), the precession frequency (let us denote it by $-\vec{\Omega}_\star$) of the spin vector of a gyroscope with respect to a frame anchored to the distant stars reads

$$-\vec{\Omega}_\star=-\frac{1}{2}\vec{v}\times\vec{a}+\frac{3}{2}\vec{v}\times\nabla U-\frac{1}{2}\nabla\times\vec{\mathcal{A}} \qquad (113)$$

(cf. e.g. Eqs. (40.33) of [76], Eqs. (3.4.38) of [26]), where $\vec{v}$ is the gyroscope's velocity with respect to the PN frame and $a^i=\nabla_{\mathbf{U}}U^i$ are the spatial components of its *covariant* acceleration. The first term, $\vec{a}\times\vec{v}/2=\vec{\Omega}_{\rm Thomas}$, is the *Thomas precession*; because of it, $\vec{\Omega}_\star$ depends on the gyroscope's acceleration. Hence, to determine $\vec{\Omega}_\star$ for gyroscopes moving with the velocities depicted in Fig. 8, we must say how they accelerate. It is natural to consider two cases: i) gyroscopes in circular motion with angular velocity $d\phi/dt$ given by (108), and ii) gyroscopes at rest in boosted PN frames *momentarily* moving with $\vec{v}=(d\phi/dt)\vec{e}_\phi$. To 1PN order, the Thomas precession is the same in both cases: in case i), the exact acceleration of the gyroscope is $\vec{a}=[M/r^2-J^2/(M^2r^3)]\vec{e}_r$; hence, using $v\simeq J/(Mr)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\vec{\Omega}_{\rm Thomas} &= -\frac{1}{2}\vec{v}\times\vec{a}=\frac{J}{2r^3}\left(1-\frac{M}{r}\left[\frac{J}{M^2}\right]^2\right)\vec{e}_z\\ &= \frac{J}{2r^3}\left[1+O(\epsilon^2)\right]\vec{e}_z\simeq\frac{\vec{J}}{2r^3}\ ,\end{aligned}$$

where $\vec{e}_z=-\vec{e}_{\hat{\theta}}$. In case ii), $\vec{v}\times\vec{a}=-\vec{v}\times\nabla U+O(\epsilon^5/L)$; hence, to the accuracy at hand, $\vec{\Omega}_{\rm Thomas}$ is the same. Observing that, in the equatorial plane, $\nabla\times\vec{\mathcal{A}}=2\vec{J}/r^3=2J\vec{e}_z/r^3$ and $\vec{v}\times\nabla U=\vec{e}_z vM/r^2$, the overall precession with respect to the distant stars is (for both cases)

$$-\vec{\Omega}_\star=\frac{3\vec{J}}{2r^3}\neq 0\ .$$

A question that naturally arises is whether there are, in the equatorial plane, velocity fields for which gyroscopes do not precess with respect to the distant stars. The answer is affirmative, but, again, acceleration dependent. If one considers gyroscopes comoving with boosted PN frames (i.e., gyroscopes moving with constant coordinate velocity, $d\vec{v}/dt=0$), then $-\vec{\Omega}_\star=2\vec{v}\times\nabla U-\frac{1}{2}\nabla\times\vec{\mathcal{A}}$, and the condition $\vec{\Omega}_\star=0$ yields $v=J/(2Mr)$. This is half the asymptotic limit of the velocity (108) for which $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}=0$, but is precisely the same as the velocity (80) for which $\vec{B}=0$ in the equatorial plane of a spinning charge (Fig. 5). Indeed, this is *physically* the analogue of the latter: $\vec{H}'=-4\vec{v}\times\nabla U+\nabla\times\vec{\mathcal{A}}=2\vec{\Omega}_\star$ is the gravitomagnetic field (see below) as measured in the PN rest frame of the gyroscope; so solving for $\vec{\Omega}_\star=0$ amounts to finding (at each point) a boosted PN frame where the gravitomagnetic field $\vec{H}'$ vanishes. Its velocity is given by Eq. (121) below, analogous to Eq. (15). Analogously to the electromagnetic case, this can be cast as a cancellation between the gravitomagnetic fields generated by the rotation and relative translation of the source. One must note, however, that this has nothing to do with the curvature invariants; it comes from the analogy (discussed in Sec. VI B 1 below) between the transformation laws for the GEM fields in the PN regime and the electromagnetic fields.

### B. "Gravitoelectromagnetic fields" (GEM Fields)

The inertial GEM fields have been defined in different ways in the literature, from the linearized theory approaches in e.g. [26, 66, 74, 89, 90], to the exact formulations in e.g. [34, 55, 59, 60, 72, 92–95]. Here we will follow the exact approach in [34], which we believe to be physically motivated, and which leads, in the corresponding limit, to the GEM fields usually defined in post-Newtonian approximations, e.g. [18, 31, 77].

Consider a congruence of observers of 4-velocity $u^\alpha$, and a test particle of worldline $z^\alpha(\tau)$ and 4-velocity $dz^\alpha/d\tau=U^\alpha$. Take it, for simplicity, to be a point-like monopole particle, and assume that there are no external forces, so that $z^\alpha(\tau)$ is geodesic. Let $U^{\langle\alpha\rangle}\equiv h^\alpha{}_\beta U^\beta$ be the spatial projection of the particle's velocity with respect to the observers, cf. Eq. (60); it can be interpreted as the relative velocity of the particle with respect to the observers. It is the variation of $U^{\langle\alpha\rangle}$ along $z^\alpha(\tau)$ that one casts as *inertial forces*; the precise definition of such variation involves some subtleties however. For that we need a connection (i.e., a covariant derivative) for spatial vectors; however the space projection of the spacetime (Levi-Civita) covariant derivative, $h^\alpha{}_\beta\nabla_{\mathbf{U}}U^{\langle\beta\rangle}$, which might seem the most obvious, is not the one we seek, as it yields the Fermi-Walker derivative of $U^{\langle\alpha\rangle}$ (i.e., its variation with respect to a system of Fermi-Walker transported axes). We seek a connection that yields the variation of $U^{\langle\alpha\rangle}$ with respect to a system of spatial axes undergoing a transport law specific to the reference frame one chooses. Given a congruence

of observers, the most natural choice would be spatial triads *co-rotating* with the observers. That is, for an orthonormal basis $\mathbf{e}_{\hat{\alpha}}$, whose general transport law along the observer congruence can be written as (e.g. [76])

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{u}}\mathbf{e}_{\hat{\beta}} = \Omega^{\hat{\alpha}}{}_{\hat{\beta}}\mathbf{e}_{\hat{\alpha}}; \quad \Omega^{\alpha\beta} = 2u^{[\alpha}a^{\beta]} + \epsilon^{\alpha\beta}{}_{\nu\mu}\Omega^{\mu}u^{\nu} \ ,$$

that amounts to choosing $\Omega^\alpha$ (the angular velocity of rotation of the spatial axes relative to Fermi-Walker transport) equal to the observer's vorticity: $\Omega^\alpha = \omega^\alpha$. If the congruence is rigid, this ensures that the $\mathbf{e}_{\hat{i}}$ point to fixed neighboring observers. One might argue [61, 62] that this is the closest generalization of the Newtonian concept of reference frame; we dub it *the congruence adapted frame*. For more details we refer to Sec. 3 of [34]. The connection that yields the variation of a spatial vector $X^\alpha$ with respect to such frame is $\tilde{\nabla}_\alpha X^\beta \equiv h^\beta{}_\gamma \nabla_\alpha X^\gamma + u_\alpha \epsilon^\beta{}_{\delta\gamma\lambda}u^\gamma X^\delta \omega^\lambda$, cf. Eq. (51) of [34]; and the inertial or "gravitoelectromagnetic" force on a test particle is the variation of $U^{\langle\alpha\rangle}$ along $z^\alpha(\tau)$ with respect to $\tilde{\nabla}$, that is $\tilde{\nabla}_{\mathbf{U}}U^{\langle\alpha\rangle} \equiv \tilde{D}U^{\langle\alpha\rangle}/d\tau$. Since, for geodesic motion, $\nabla_{\mathbf{U}}U^\alpha = 0$, it follows, using (60), that $\tilde{\nabla}_{\mathbf{U}}U^{\langle\alpha\rangle} = -\gamma(\nabla_{\mathbf{U}}u^\alpha + \epsilon^\beta{}_{\delta\gamma\lambda}u^\gamma X^\delta \omega^\lambda)$, where $\gamma \equiv -U_\alpha u^\alpha$. Finally, from the decomposition (cf. Eq. (59))

$$\nabla_\beta u_\alpha \equiv u_{\alpha;\beta} = -u_\beta \nabla_{\mathbf{u}} u_\alpha - \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}\omega^\gamma u^\delta + \sigma_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{\theta}{3}h_{\alpha\beta} \ , \tag{114}$$

we have [34] (noting that $\nabla_{\mathbf{U}}u^\alpha = U^\beta \nabla_\beta u^\alpha$)

$$\frac{\tilde{D}U^{\langle\alpha\rangle}}{d\tau} = \gamma\left[\gamma G^\alpha + \epsilon^\alpha{}_{\beta\gamma\delta}u^\delta U^\beta H^\gamma - \sigma^\alpha{}_\beta U^\beta - \frac{\theta}{3}h^\alpha{}_\beta U^\beta\right], \tag{115}$$

where

$$G^\alpha = -\nabla_{\mathbf{u}}u^\alpha \ ; \qquad H^\alpha = 2\omega^\alpha \tag{116}$$

are, respectively, the "gravitoelectric" and "gravitomagnetic" fields. These are *exact* GEM fields, herein defined in terms of the kinematical quantities of the observers' congruence; they play in (115) a role analogous to the electric and magnetic field in the Lorentz force. One should keep in mind that $G^\alpha$ *is minus the observers' acceleration*, and $H^\alpha$ *twice their vorticity*. For the observers at rest ($u^i = 0$) in a given coordinate system, $G^i = \Gamma^i_{00}/g_{00}$, $H^i = -\epsilon^{ij}{}_k\Gamma^k_{0j}/g_{00}$; hence, to first post-Newtonian (1PN) order,[20]

$$\vec{G} = \nabla w - \frac{\partial \vec{\mathcal{A}}}{\partial t} + O(\epsilon^6/L\ ); \quad \vec{H} = \nabla \times \vec{\mathcal{A}} + O(\epsilon^5/L\ ), \tag{117}$$

which match the GEM fields in Eqs. (3.21) of [31], or Eqs. (2.5) of [69]. The 1PN limit of (115) takes the form[21]

$$\frac{d^2\vec{x}}{dt^2} = (1+v^2-2U)\vec{G} + \vec{v}\times\vec{H} - 3\frac{\partial U}{\partial t}\vec{v} - 4(\vec{G}\cdot\vec{v})\vec{v} \ . \tag{118}$$

which matches[22] Eq. (7.17) of [31]. Linearizing Eqs. (117)-(118) one obtains (up to some factors depending on the conventions) the GEM fields and geodesic equation of the linearized theory approaches [26, 66, 74, 89–91].

### 1. *post-Newtonian frames where $\vec{H} = 0$*

The transformation laws for the GEM fields in a change of reference frame exhibit some similarities to their electromagnetic counterparts. The exact forms are given in Eqs. (8.3) of [59]. To 1PN order, the GEM fields of a boosted PN frame can be obtained applying a post-Galilean coordinate transformation (e.g. Eqs. (13) of [71]) to the metric, and then computing expressions (117) for the boosted potentials. In the case of $\vec{H}$ we have

$$\vec{H}' = \vec{H} - 4\vec{v}\times\vec{G} \tag{119}$$

(cf. Eqs. (5) of [9], Eq. (4.20b) of [31]), formally similar to the post-Coulombian limit of Eq. (10), apart for the factor of 4 in the second term. It is clear from (119) that when $\vec{G}\cdot\vec{H} = 0$ and $\vec{G}^2 > \vec{H}^2$ one can always find a boost velocity $\vec{v}$ such that

$$\vec{H}' = 0 \ \Rightarrow \ 4\vec{v}\times\vec{G} = \vec{H} \ . \tag{120}$$

This is in analogy with the situation in electromagnetism in Sec. II A for the vanishing of $\vec{B}$. Here $\vec{v}$ is such that its component $\vec{v}_{\perp G}$ orthogonal to $\vec{G}$ reads (taking the cross product of (120) with $\vec{G}$)

$$\vec{v}_{\perp G} = \frac{\vec{G}\times\vec{H}}{4G^2} \ , \tag{121}$$

in analogy with Eq. (15); and likewise no condition is imposed on $\vec{v}_{\parallel G}$. An example is the case of the equatorial plane of the field produced by a spinning body, where $\vec{G} \perp \vec{H}$ (and $\vec{G}^2 > \vec{H}^2$), and indeed, as we have seen in Sec. VI A, at each point one can find PN frames where $\vec{H}' = 0$ at that point.

However (contrary to what has been suggested in some literature [1, 2, 26–29]), this has nothing to do with field

---

[20] Using the 1PN Christoffel symbols, e.g. Eqs. (8.15) of [77], identifying $w \to U + \Psi$, $\mathcal{A}_i \to -4U_i$ in the notation therein.

[21] Noting that, to 1PN, $\tilde{D}U^{\langle i\rangle}/d\tau = (U^0)^2 d^2x^i/dt^2 + 2v^i\partial_t U - v^2 G^i + 4v^i\vec{G}\cdot\vec{v}$, $\sigma_{\alpha\beta} = 0$, $\theta = 3\partial_t U$ and $\gamma^2/(U^0)^2 = 1 - 2U + O(\epsilon^4)$.

[22] Noting that by $\vec{G} \equiv G^i\partial_i$ we denote the spatial components of $G^\alpha$ *in the PN coordinate basis*, and that, to 1PN order, $G_i = G^j(1+2U)\delta_{ij} = G^i + 2UG^i$.

invariants: firstly, $\vec{G}\cdot\vec{H}$ and $G^2-H^2$ are not frame invariant[23] ($\vec{G}$ and $\vec{H}$ are actually mere artifacts of the reference frame, which vanish in a locally inertial one); secondly, they do not have any obvious relation with the curvature invariants. Indeed, as one may check computing $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}=16\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta}\mathbb{H}^{\alpha\beta}$ using Eqs. (124)-(125) below, one can have e.g. $\vec{G}\cdot\vec{H}\neq 0$ whilst $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}=0$, or $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}\neq 0$ whilst $\vec{G}\cdot\vec{H}=0$.

### 2. Relation between GEM fields and tidal tensors

It is of crucial importance to distinguish between the gravitational tidal tensors $\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta}$, $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$ and the inertial fields $\vec{G}$, $\vec{H}$. A first obvious difference is that whereas $\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$ are physical fields, governing *physical* forces such as the spin-curvature force exerted on a gyroscope, Eq. (110a) (which is the covariant derivative of the 4-momentum), $\vec{G}$ and $\vec{H}$ are artifacts of the reference frame, governing fictitious forces and torques, such as the inertial force in Eq. (115), or the gyroscope "precession" in Eq. (110a) (an ordinary derivative of $\vec{S}$). The *exact* relation between the two types of objects is complicated in general; it is given by Eqs. (109)-(110) of [34]. In this work we are interested in two special cases where it becomes simpler: exact stationary fields, and arbitrary fields to first post-Newtonian order.

In a rigid frame in a stationary spacetime we have (Eqs. (111)-(112) of [34]),

$$\mathbb{E}_{ij}=-\nabla^{\perp}_j G_i+G_iG_j+\frac{1}{4}\left(H^2h_{ij}-H_jH_i\right)\;, \tag{122}$$

$$\mathbb{H}_{ij}=-\frac{1}{2}\left[\nabla^{\perp}_j H_i+(\vec{G}\cdot\vec{H})h_{ij}-2G_jH_i\right]\;, \tag{123}$$

where $h_{\alpha\beta}$ is the spatial metric, cf. Eq. (60), and $\nabla^{\perp}$ the connection defined by Eq. (61), whose restriction to the spatial directions (which equals that of $\tilde{\nabla}$) yields the Levi-Civita connection of $h_{\alpha\beta}$.

In an arbitrary spacetime, to 1PN order, we have,

$$\mathbb{E}_{ij}=-\nabla_jG_i+G_iG_j+\frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ijk}\frac{\partial H^k}{\partial t}-\frac{\partial^2U}{\partial t^2}\delta_{ij}+O(\epsilon^6/L^2); \tag{124}$$

$$\mathbb{H}_{ij}=-\frac{1}{2}\nabla_jH_i-\epsilon_{ijk}\frac{\partial G^k}{\partial t}+O(\epsilon^5/L^2)\;, \tag{125}$$

in agreement with Eqs. (3.38) and (3.41) of [31].[24] In the *linear* regime, and when the fields are *stationary*, the gravitational tidal tensors reduce to *derivatives* of the GEM fields: $\mathbb{E}_{ij}\approx -G_{i;j}$, $\mathbb{H}_{ij}\approx -H_{i;j}/2$.

### 3. Uniform gravitomagnetic fields

A pedagogical example that illustrates how crucial it is to distinguish between the GEM inertial fields $\vec{G},\vec{H}$ and the GEM tidal tensors $\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta},\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$ (showing that there is no direct relation between $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}$ and $\vec{H}$) is to consider spacetimes with uniform gravitomagnetic fields. Examples of such spacetimes are the Gödel universe, and one particular class of the Som-Raychaudhuri solutions. These are "ultrastationary spacetimes", whose line element may be expressed as

$$ds^2=-\left(dt-\mathcal{A}_i(x^k)dx^i\right)^2+h_{ij}(x^k)dx^idx^j\;. \tag{126}$$

For the Gödel universe [82],

$$\mathcal{A}_idx^i=-e^{\sqrt{2}\omega x}dy\;,\quad h_{ij}dx^idx^j=dx^2+\frac{1}{2}e^{2\sqrt{2}\omega x}dy^2+dz^2\;, \tag{127}$$

where $\omega$ is a constant. It corresponds to a homogeneous, rotating dust with negative cosmological constant.

The Som-Raychaudhuri metrics [83] are cylindrically symmetric solutions corresponding to rigidly rotating charged dust for which the Lorentz force vanishes everywhere. In the case where the charge, mass, and electromagnetic field energy densities are uniform, the metric reads (cf. Eq. (28) of [83])

$$\mathcal{A}_idx^i=\omega r^2d\phi\;,\quad h_{ij}dx^idx^j=dr^2+r^2d\phi^2+dz^2\;. \tag{128}$$

The metrics (127)-(128) have special properties. Observers at rest in their coordinate systems, $u^\alpha=\delta^\alpha_0$, form a rigid congruence with zero acceleration (as in all metrics of the form (126)), and *uniform* vorticity $\vec{\omega}=\omega\vec{e}_z$. That is, in a frame adapted to such observers, the gravitoelectric field vanishes, and there is a *non-zero* uniform gravitomagnetic field:

$$\vec{G}=\vec{0}\;,\qquad \vec{H}=2\omega\vec{e}_z\;. \tag{129}$$

In terms of the curvature, the situation is precisely the *opposite*. From Eqs. (122)-(123), the gravitoelectric and gravitomagnetic tidal tensors as measured by these observers read ($\mathbb{E}_{0\alpha}=\mathbb{E}_{\alpha0}=0$)

$$\mathbb{E}_{ij}=\frac{1}{4}\left(\vec{H}^2h_{ij}-H_jH_i\right)\;;\qquad \mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}=0\;,$$

i.e., a non-zero gravitoelectric tidal tensor, and a vanishing gravitomagnetic tidal tensor everywhere. The Riemann tensor is said to be *purely electric* (e.g. [87]). It follows from Eq. (49) that the invariant $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}$ is also zero everywhere.

Thus, from the point of view of the curvature, the metrics (126)-(128) represent purely electric spacetimes, with

---

[23] Restricting ourselves to *post-Newtonian frames*, we can still say that $\vec{G}\cdot\vec{H}$ is invariant, *to 1PN order*, under changes of PN frame, since, as follows from Eqs. (5) of [9], $\vec{G}\cdot\vec{H}=\vec{G}'\cdot\vec{H}'+O(\epsilon^7/L^2)$; however, $\vec{G}^2-\vec{H}^2$, to that accuracy, is not.

[24] To obtain Eq. (3.38) of [31] from (124), one notes that $\nabla_jG_i\simeq G_{i,j}-\Gamma^k_{ij}G_k=G_{i,j}-2G_iG_j+\delta_{ij}G^2$, and $\nabla\times\vec{G}=-\partial\vec{H}/\partial t$, cf. Eq. (94) of [34].

$\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta} \neq 0$ and $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ globally with respect to a rigid congruence of observers, namely the rest observers in the coordinates of (126); from the point of view of the GEM inertial fields, by contrast, one would say that they are *purely magnetic*, since $\vec{G} = \vec{0}$ and $\vec{H} \neq \vec{0}$ for the same observers. It is actually impossible to make $\vec{H}$ vanish in any rigid frame, which can be seen as follows. From Eq. (91) of [34], we have, for a rigid frame, $\tilde{\nabla} \times \vec{H} = -16\pi\vec{\mathcal{J}}$, where $\tilde{\nabla}$ denotes the Levi-Civita connection of the spatial metric $h_{ij}$, and $\mathcal{J}^\alpha$ is the spatial mass/energy current as defined in Sec. V. Hence, $\vec{H} = \vec{0}$ requires $\vec{\mathcal{J}} = \vec{0}$ in that frame. In the Gödel universe, for an observer of arbitrary 4-velocity $u^\alpha$, $\mathcal{J}^\alpha$ reads

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{J}^i &= -\frac{\omega^2 u^i \alpha^2}{4\pi} \ ; \\ \mathcal{J}^0 &= \frac{\omega^2\alpha}{4\pi}\left(e^{\sqrt{2}\omega x}u^0u^y + \frac{e^{2\sqrt{2}\omega x}}{2}(u^y)^2 - (u^x)^2 - (u^z)^2\right)\end{aligned}$$

where $\alpha \equiv u^0 + e^{\sqrt{2}\omega x}u^y$. For time-like vectors it is not possible to have $u^y/u^0 = -e^{-\sqrt{2}\omega x}$ (the norm of such vector would read $u^\alpha u_\alpha = (u^0)^2/2 + (u^x)^2 + (u^z)^2 > 0$); we thus see that the only observers with respect to which $\mathcal{J}^i = 0$ are the rest observers $u^i = 0$ (which are comoving with the fluid). Since $\omega^\alpha \neq 0$ for those observers, no rigid congruences with vanishing vorticity exist in this spacetime, that is, $\vec{H} \neq \vec{0}$ for frames adapted to any rigid congruence of observers. A similar proof can be made for the metric (128).

To see the consequences in terms of motion of test particles, consider gyroscopes at rest ($U^\alpha = \delta^\alpha_0$) in the coordinate system of (126). These feel no spin-curvature force, since $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta} = 0$, cf. Eq. (110a); they will actually remain at rest in that coordinate system since, moreover, they feel no gravitoelectric field (as the frame is freely falling), cf. Eqs. (129). However they precess relative to the frame adapted to these observers (i.e., to the basis vectors of the coordinate system of $h_{ij}$) with angular velocity $-\vec{\omega} = -\omega\vec{e}_z = -\vec{H}/2$, like a magnetic dipole under a uniform magnetic field, cf. Eq. (110b). Moreover, there is no rigid frame relative to which the gyroscopes do not precess. In fact, the only precession effect that vanishes due to the vanishing of $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$ is the so-called "differential precession", that is, the precession of a gyroscope relative to a system of axes anchored to a set of neighboring, infinitesimally close gyroscopes, as this is a tidal effect governed precisely by $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$, see Eq. (3.11) of [110] (cf. also Sec. 2.3 of [35]). We believe this to be enough to convince the reader about the importance of distinguishing between GEM *inertial* and *tidal* fields, and that indeed the invariant $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}$ is not a good test for "intrinsic gravitomagnetic field".

### C. What the invariants say about the GEM fields

As is explicit in Eqs. (22)-(25), it is the electric and magnetic parts of the curvature (and their possible vanishing for some observers), *not* the GEM fields, that are directly related with the curvature invariants. However, still there are special cases where indeed from the curvature invariants one can infer information about the gravitomagnetic field itself.

First let us discuss what can be understood as a physically meaningful gravitomagnetic field, that can be identified with the effects that have been under experimental and observational scrutiny. The gravitomagnetic field $\vec{H}$ is an inertial field, i.e., a reference frame artifact, that can always be gauged away by choosing a locally inertial frame. Thus, *locally*, it has no physical meaning; yet it may reflect *global* physical properties of a given spacetime. For instance, the "precession" of a gyroscope (at a finite $r$) in the Kerr spacetime with respect to a frame anchored to the distant stars, discussed in Sec. VI A, reflects an effect — frame-dragging — which is physical, and intrinsic in the sense that it distinguishes the Kerr metric from a static solution (e.g. the Schwarzschild spacetime). Its *non-local* nature is manifest in the fact that in order to measure it one needs to lock the frame to the distant stars by means of telescopes [70]. Thus, one can say that frame-dragging occurs when at some point a system of locally non-rotating axes (defined mathematically by the Fermi-Walker transport law, or physically by guiding gyroscopes, see Sec. VI A) rotates relative to an inertial frame at infinity. In other words, when $\vec{H}$ is non-vanishing in a reference frame with axes rotationally locked to an inertial frame at infinity (star-fixed axes). This is however a concept that makes sense only in a special class of spacetimes. Firstly they must be asymptotically flat; and even in that case, in general one has no way of determining the rotation of a system of axes at one point relative to another system of axes at a different point (since in a curved spacetime there is a priori no natural way of comparing vectors in different tangent spaces). This is possible only if, in addition, the spacetime admits shear-free observer congruences. In order to see this, consider an orthonormal tetrad frame $\mathbf{e}_{\hat{\alpha}}$, whose time axis $\mathbf{e}_{\hat{0}} = \mathbf{u}$ is the 4-velocity of some congruence of observers. Let $X^\alpha$ be a connecting vector between the worldlines of the observers, $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{u}}X^\alpha = 0$, and $Y^\alpha = (h^u)^\alpha{}_\beta X^\beta$ its space projection; $Y^\alpha$ evolves in the tetrad as (Eq. (41) of [34])

$$\dot{Y}_{\hat{i}} = \left(\sigma_{\hat{i}\hat{j}} + \frac{1}{3}\theta\delta_{\hat{i}\hat{j}} + \omega_{\hat{i}\hat{j}} - \Omega_{\hat{i}\hat{j}}\right)Y^{\hat{j}} \ .$$

If the congruence is rigid ($\sigma_{\hat{i}\hat{j}} = \theta = 0$), and one chooses spatial triads $\mathbf{e}_{\hat{i}}$ co-rotating with the observers, $\omega_{\hat{i}\hat{j}} = \Omega_{\hat{i}\hat{j}}$ (see Sec. VI B), $Y^\alpha$ is constant in the tetrad, $\dot{Y}_{\hat{i}} = 0$. Hence the triads $\mathbf{e}_{\hat{i}}$ point to fixed neighboring observers. If the congruence is inertial at infinity, this means (since it is rigid) that the $\mathbf{e}_{\hat{i}}$ are locked to an inertial frame at in-

finity. Hence, by measuring the precession of a gyroscope with respect to the local axes $\mathbf{e}_{\hat{i}}$, one is in fact measuring it with respect to the distant stars, and it has thus a clear meaning in terms of frame-dragging. If the congruence is not rigid but only expands (i.e., no traceless shear, $\sigma_{\hat{i}\hat{j}}=0$), then $\dot{Y}_{\hat{i}}=\theta Y_{\hat{i}}/3$; i.e., $Y^{\alpha}$, albeit not constant, has a fixed direction on the tetrad, so similar arguments still apply. When the congruence shears ($\sigma_{\hat{i}\hat{j}}\neq 0$), however, one has no way of locking the frame to an inertial frame at infinity, and therefore the gravitomagnetic field measured in a frame adapted to such congruence has no relevant physical meaning.

We thus conclude that if an asymptotically flat spacetime admits a shear-free observer congruence which is inertial at infinity, the frame adapted to it has axes fixed with respect to the distant stars, and the gravitomagnetic field $\vec{H}$ measured therein has a meaning[25] in terms of precession of gyroscopes and deflection of test particles with respect to the distant stars (this is the case of any post-Newtonian frame to 1PN order, as $\sigma_{ij}=0$ for the rest observers in the 1PN metric (85)). Now, the connection with the curvature invariants and with $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$ is the following. Since $\vec{H}$ is twice the vorticity of the observers, cf. Eq. (116), the vanishing of $\vec{H}$ requires the congruence to be vorticity-free (also known as a *"normal"* congruence). It is known, in the framework of the exact theory (see [54], Proposition 2; or [109], Theorem 3), that relative to shear- and vorticity-free observer congruences the magnetic part of the Weyl tensor vanishes, $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha\beta}=0$. As we have seen in Sec. III, necessary conditions are

$$\mathbf{C}\cdot\mathbf{C}>0\ ,\qquad \star\mathbf{C}\cdot\mathbf{C}=0\ , \tag{130}$$

plus the conditions obtained from (35) by replacing $\mathbf{R}\to\mathbf{C}$. These are not however, in general, *sufficient* conditions for the existence of shear- and vorticity-free congruences (they only ensure that $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha\beta}=0$ for some $u^{\alpha}$). Only in the special cases of vacuum or "electrovacuum" Petrov type D solutions, it is known (see [79], Theorem 2.1, Appendix B and proposition B.1 therein) that these conditions, when they hold in some *open 4-D spacetime region*, are indeed sufficient to ensure the existence of shear- and vorticity-free congruences. In Petrov type D vacuum, in particular, since $\mathbf{C}=\mathbf{R}$, and since (31) is always obeyed, one can say that when[26] $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}=0$ in some open 4-D region, a shear-free normal congruence exists therein. If the spacetime is asymptotically flat, and such congruence inertial at infinity, then this means that there is a frame rotationally locked to the distant stars (and where frame dragging is a well defined notion) where $\vec{H}$ vanishes.

This is all one can say about $\vec{H}$ based on the curvature invariants. It is of limited applicability for the astrophysical systems under discussion. Among the systems studied in the present paper, only the fields of a single non-spinning/spinning body can be seen as Petrov type D vacua, as they are approximately described by the Schwarzschild/Kerr solutions (as for the two-body metric in Sec. V B, although the exact solution is not known, its post-Newtonian limit is already incompatible with the type D at any point off the Earth-Sun axis, as we have seen therein). Schwarzschild's solution is purely electric everywhere, so there are indeed a shear-free normal congruences everywhere, one of them the static observers $\mathbf{u}\propto\partial/\partial t$. That is, $\vec{H}=0$ everywhere relative to the static observers. In the case of Kerr spacetime, the only purely electric region outside the horizon is the equatorial plane; this is a 3D hypersurface, not an *open* 4D spacetime region. Hence, in spite of $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}=0$ at the equatorial plane, there is no congruence which is shear- and vorticity-free therein; and the fact that $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}\neq 0$ elsewhere implies that such congruences do not exist at all in this spacetime. This means that $\vec{H}\neq 0$ in a frame adapted to any non-shearing congruence of observers in the Kerr spacetime.

### D. New criteria for intrinsic/extrinsic gravitomagnetism

Given the interest on these notions in the literature, and the unsatisfactory character of the existing ones, in this section we propose new criteria for extrinsic/intrinsic gravitomagnetism. Similarly to previous approaches in the literature [1, 26], we start from the observation of the situation for electromagnetic fields in flat spacetime to get insight, but devise criteria that are more *physically* motivated and that make sense in view of knowledge gathered in the previous sections.

For electromagnetism in *flat* spacetime, the following classification seems reasonable:

- **a)** globally extrinsic (intrinsic) magnetic field: there is (there is not) a globally inertial frame where $\vec{B}=0$ everywhere in the region of interest. Example of globally extrinsic $\vec{B}$: Coulomb field of a point charge.
- **b)** Locally extrinsic (intrinsic) magnetic field: there are (there are not), at the given point, observers measuring $\vec{B}=0$. Amounts to the notion of "purely electric" field, given by the invariant conditions ii) of Sec. II. Examples of globally intrinsic but locally extrinsic magnetic field: equatorial plane of a spinning charge; motion plane of two charged bodies

[25] This is not the only gravitomagnetic field that has a meaning in terms of frame-dragging. For instance, the gravitomagnetic field $\vec{H}_{\rm LNR}$ measured in the so-called "locally non-rotating frames" considered in [34, 95, 96], associated to a shearing congruence (the zero angular momentum observers), and where $\Omega_{\hat{i}\hat{j}}\neq\omega_{\hat{i}\hat{j}}$ (the triads $\mathbf{e}_{\hat{i}}$ are tied to the background symmetries), signals frame-dragging and vanishes in a static spacetime; however, this frame is not tied to the distant stars, thus it does not correspond to the gravitomagnetic field under experimental scrutiny.

[26] The possibility $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}=0$, $\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}<0$ is ruled out since all Petrov type D vacua are known, and none of them is purely magnetic.

in co-planar motion. Example of (globally, and at every point locally) intrinsic magnetic field: field of spinning charge outside the equatorial plane.

Note that a) implies b), but not the other way around. The distinction between globally/locally extrinsic, and casting globally inertial frames as preferred in this context, seems to make sense from the analysis in Sec. IV, as indeed there is a substantial difference between e.g. the Coulomb field of a point charge and the field in the equatorial plane of a spinning charge. In the former, $\vec{B}=0$ everywhere in the inertial rest frame of the charge; this may be cast as the vanishing of $\vec{B}$ everywhere for a family of observers all with the "same" 4-velocity (the observers "at rest with respect to the charge"), since in flat spacetime we have a well defined notion of parallelism,[27] and can thus talk about the relative velocity of distant observers. In the case of a spinning charge, as we have seen in Sec. IV C, $\vec{B}$ can be made to vanish everywhere in the equatorial plane, but *not in an inertial frame*; only with respect to shearing observer congruences (of angular velocity (80)). With respect to an inertial frame, $\vec{B}$ vanishes only at a point (different in general for different inertial frames). That is, observers exist for which $\vec{B}=0$, but their 4-velocity differs from point to point. To generalize this to curved spacetime, the obvious difficulty is that there are no globally inertial frames, and the parallelism of vectors (thus the relative velocity of observers) at different points is not a well defined notion. There is a *local* notion of difference (with respect to the Levi-Civita connection) between the 4-velocities of (infinitesimally close) neighboring observers in a congruence, which is given by, cf. Eqs. (59), (114),

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{X}} u^\alpha = -\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} X^\beta \omega^\gamma u^\delta + \theta_{\alpha\beta} X^\beta + \frac{\theta}{3} X^\alpha \ , \qquad (131)$$

for any spatial vector $X^\alpha$ orthogonal to $u^\alpha$ ($X^\alpha u_\alpha = 0$). That tells us that the observer's 4-velocity differs from that of its neighbors when the congruence has shear, expansion or vorticity. It turns out that congruences where they all vanish do not exist in general (in particular, the spacetime would need to be Weyl purely electric, see Sec. VI C; for Petrov type D vacua, for instance, this requires the spacetime to be static, see Theorem 2.2 in [79]). We propose generalizing criteria a)-b) to general relativity by replacing "globally inertial frames" by "shear-free frames" (i.e., allowing the preferred frame to have vorticity and expansion, but no traceless shear). The justification is that such replacement, in flat spacetime, leaves the above classification unchanged for all the examples studied (which would not be the case for vorticity-free or expansion-free frames[28]). Moreover, shearfree (not vorticity-free or expansion-free) frames are the case of post-Newtonian frames (to 1PN order), which may be regarded as the closest entity in a curved spacetime to the globally inertial frame of flat spacetime.

In this generalized form, the criteria can be closely mirrored for the gravitational field.

Starting by the curvature tensor,

**c)** globally extrinsic (intrinsic) gravitomagnetic curvature: there is (there is not) a non-shearing congruence of observers measuring $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}=0$ everywhere within the region of interest. Examples: all static spacetimes, e.g. Schwarzschild; FLRW metrics; uniform gravitomagnetic fields (e.g. Gödel universe).

**d)** Locally extrinsic (intrinsic) gravitomagnetic curvature – there are (there are not), at the given point, observers measuring $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}=0$. It amounts to the notion of "purely electric curvature", given, *in vacuum*, by the invariant conditions ii) of Sec. III. Examples of globally intrinsic but locally extrinsic magnetic curvature: equatorial plane of spinning body; orbital plane of 2-body systems. Example of (globally, and at every point locally) intrinsic magnetic curvature: Kerr spacetime outside the equatorial plane.

Note that c) implies d), but not the other way around. As for the gravitomagnetic *field* $\vec{H}$:

**e)** globally extrinsic (intrinsic) gravitomagnetic field: there is (there is not) a non-shearing congruence of observers measuring $\vec{H}=0$ everywhere inside the region of interest. It amounts to the existence of shear- and vorticity-free observer congruences (Sec. VI C). Examples: all static spacetimes (e.g. Schwarzschild); FLRW metrics.

**f)** Locally extrinsic (intrinsic) gravitomagnetic field (only for PN approximation): there are (there are not) PN frames where $\vec{H}=0$ at the given point. It amounts to the conditions $\vec{G}\cdot\vec{H}=0$, $\vec{G}^2>\vec{H}^2$ (see Sec. VI B 1). Examples of globally intrinsic but locally extrinsic $\vec{H}$: equatorial plane of spinning body; orbital plane of 2-body systems. Example of (globally, and at every point locally) intrinsic $\vec{H}$: metric of spinning body outside the equatorial plane.

Criterion f) has no relation with any field invariants (see Sec. VI B 1). Criterion e) does not translate into a condition on the invariants, although it has a relation with the

[27] Namely parallelism with respect to the Levi-Civita connection. It amounts to saying that two observers have the same 4-velocity if $u^\alpha = u'^\alpha$ in a rectangular coordinate system.

[28] For instance the velocity field (80) for which $\vec{B}=0$ in the equatorial plane of a spinning charge is vorticity and expansion free, see Footnote 12; however $\vec{B}\neq 0$ (except at a point) in this plane with respect to any inertial frame.

| Electromagnetism | | Examples |
|---|---|---|
| Globally extrinsic $\vec{B}$ | | • EM field of any static charge distribution (e.g Coulomb field) |
| Globally intrinsic $\vec{B}$ | Locally extrinsic | • equatorial plane of spinning charge<br>• motion plane of 2-body systems |
| | Locally intrinsic | • spinning charge outside equatorial plane<br>• 2-body systems outside motion plane |
| **Gravity** | | **Examples** |
| Globally extrinsic $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$ | | • any static spacetime (e.g Schwarzschild)<br>• vacuum spacetimes with globally extrinsic $\vec{H}$<br>• spacetimes with uniform $\vec{H}$ (e.g. Godel) |
| Globally intrinsic $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$ | Locally extrinsic | • equatorial plane of spinning body<br>• orbital plane of 2-body systems |
| | Locally intrinsic | • spinning body outside equatorial plane<br>• 2-body systems outside orbital plane |
| Globally extrinsic $\vec{H}$ | | • any static spacetime (e.g Schwarzschild)<br>• FLRW metrics |
| Globally intrinsic $\vec{H}$ | Exact theory | • Kerr spacetime everywhere<br>• any vacuum open spacetime region with locally intrinsic $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$ |
| | Locally extrinsic (PN theory only) | • equatorial plane of spinning body<br>• orbital plane of 2-body systems |
| | Locally "intrinsic" (PN theory only) | • spinning body outside equatorial plane<br>• 2-body systems outside orbital plane |

Table II: Proposed classification scheme for magnetic field $\vec{B}$, gravitomagnetic tidal tensor $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$, and gravitomagnetic field $\vec{H}$. Note that "globally extrinsic" implies "locally extrinsic" everywhere in the region of interest, but not the other way around. Locally intrinsic implies globally intrinsic, but not the other way around. (The examples given pertain to the systems studied in this paper, thus are not exhaustive.)

invariants of the Weyl tensor, in the sense that shear-free observer congruences exist only when the Weyl tensor is purely electric; but not the other way around, cf. Sec. VI C. Note the distinction between extrinsic gravitomagnetic curvature $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$ and field $\vec{H}$: a spacetime can be globally extrinsic in terms of the former, whilst not in terms of the later; examples are the Gödel universe or the Som-Raychaudhuri metrics studied in Sec. VI B 3. When $\vec{H}$ is globally extrinsic, it means that there is a non-shearing frame (the frame adapted to the shear- and vorticity-free congruence) relative to which all gyroscopes whose center of mass is at rest do *not* precess. If such frame is inertial at infinity, then it means that no gyroscope at rest in such frame precesses with respect to the distant stars. Criterion f) is a notion that makes sense only in the framework of the post-Newtonian approximation. One might argue that no inertial fields should ever be dubbed "locally intrinsic", as they can always be made to vanish by switching to a locally inertial frame. Still this notion (as long as limited to the PN framework), seems useful to distinguish the situation in static spacetimes from e.g. the equatorial plane of the field of a spinning body, or the orbital plane of a 2-body system. The gravitomagnetic field in this regime is formally very similar to the magnetic field, and what is said in point b) above applies to $\vec{H}$ and to the analogous gravitational systems, replacing inertial frames by PN frames. Hence a formally analogous criterion makes sense. Moreover, $\vec{H}$ in this framework always has a meaning in terms of precession of gyroscopes with respect to the distant stars, since the basis vectors of PN coordinate systems are locked to inertial frames at infinity.

Regarding the astrophysical setups of interest, these criteria clearly distinguish between the gravitational field of a single translating non-spinning body, which has globally extrinsic gravitomagnetic curvature and field, and the fields of a spinning body or of a system of two bodies orbiting each other; but not between these last two fields, as they both have gravitomagnetic curvature and field which is globally intrinsic, locally extrinsic in the equatorial/orbital planes, and locally intrinsic, generically, elsewhere. The proposed scheme is summarized in Table II.

## VII. CONCLUSION

Motivated by the recent interest in the curvature invariants and their formal analogies with the invariants of the Maxwell tensor, in the context of the debate on the notions of "intrinsic"/"extrinsic" gravitomagnetism and their detection in solar system based experiments and astronomical observations, we thoroughly discussed in this work the invariants, their mathematical meaning and physical interpretation, and what they actually tell us about the motion of test particles.

We started with a rigorous discussion of the algebraic meaning of the invariants. The quadratic invariants of the Maxwell tensor give conditions for the existence of observers for which one of the fields (magnetic or electric) vanishes; an explicit expression (Eq. (15)) for their velocities was derived. The curvature invariants are analogously related with conditions for the existence of observers for which the magnetic or electric parts of the curvature vanish. The expressions for their velocities were also obtained, which, for a special class of spacetimes (Petrov type D vacua, Eq. (45)), exhibit a strong formal analogy with the electromagnetic counterpart. In the gravitational case, however, the quadratic invariants are not sufficient. For the Weyl tensor (thus also for the Riemann tensor, in vacuum), such conditions involve also the cubic invariants, and the invariants are even insufficient if a certain relation between them holds (see (31) and (34)-(35) in Sec. III A). For the Riemann tensor in the presence of sources, no such conditions are even known. A consequence of this, concerning the proposal in the literature [1, 2, 26] of using the Chern-Pontryagin invariant $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}$ as a probe for intrinsic gravitomagnetism, is that even though its non-vanishing has a clear meaning, implying that $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}\neq 0$ for all observers, the converse is not true, i.e., the condition $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}=0$ *alone* does not have a special significance (it does not ensure that $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}=0$ for some observer, even in vacuum). Thus, even prior to physical considerations, one notes that such criteria are based on incomplete conditions.

Then we investigated the physical principles behind the behavior of the invariants in different systems, with emphasis on $\star\mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{F}$ and $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}$, and the question of why $B^\alpha$ and $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$ vanish for certain observers in some systems and not in others. An explanation based on a loose notion of relative motion has been suggested in [26] (p. 358): *"spacetime geometry and the corresponding curvature invariants are affected and determined, not only by mass-energy, but also by mass-energy currents relative to other mass, that is, mass-energy currents not generable nor eliminable by any Lorentz transformation"* (with a similar explanation for the electromagnetic case). This is not, however, satisfactory, since in a curved spacetime the relative motion of distant objects is not possible to define unambiguously (as there is no global notion of parallelism). Different definitions of relative velocity have been proposed in the literature (see [63, 64]); however, a direct relation of any of these with the curvature invariants seems to be ruled out by simple arguments.[29] We looked instead into the field equations — the Maxwell equations for $B^\alpha$, in its general form for arbitrary frames in arbitrary spacetimes, and, on the gravitational side, the so-called "higher order field equations" for $\mathcal{H}_{\alpha\beta}$ and $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$ — since they are always valid, and checked what one can say about the invariants based on them (points 1-4 of Secs. IV and V). Concerning the explanation above, our results show that it is *partially* correct, but as a feature of the weak field slow motion approximation: if the system is such that a post-Newtonian frame exists where mass currents $\vec{\mathcal{J}}$ vanish everywhere, then (to 1PN accuracy) $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}=0$; the converse, however, is *not true* (i.e., when there is no PN frame where $\vec{\mathcal{J}}=0$ everywhere, that does not ensure $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}\neq 0$). This is in close analogy with the electromagnetic invariants in *flat* spacetime: if the setup is such that an inertial frame exists where all currents (charge and displacement) are zero, then $\star\mathbf{F}\cdot\mathbf{F}=0$; but the converse is not true. In the more general cases of electromagnetic fields in a curved spacetime, or gravity outside the PN regime, things are more complicated because one has no inertial or PN frames, and in generic frames the observer's vorticity, shear and expansion act as sources of the fields (in addition to the currents).

We studied and physically interpreted the structure of the invariants in the astrophysical setups of interest — the field of a single non-spinning body (the one effectively involved in the measured gravitomagnetic effects in binary pulsars, and in the geodetic precession of the Earth-Moon system in the Sun's field), described by the Schwarzschild solution, the field of a system of two bodies to first post-Newtonian order (involved in the LLR measurements of the Moon's orbit), and the exact Kerr field (which approximately describes the field of a spinning body, namely the Earth) — and their electromagnetic analogues: the exact fields of single non-spinning and spinning charged bodies, and two-body systems to first "post-Coulombian" approximation. The electromagnetic analogy proved illuminating to explain the structure of the gravitational invariants; to post-Newtonian order, in particular, a similar reasoning can be employed. We found that the invariant structure of the field of a single non-spinning body (where $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}=0$ everywhere) is clearly different from that of a spinning body, in agreement with the analysis in [1, 26]; but that the latter (contrary to the claim in [1]) is not substantially different from that of a system of two bodies orbiting each other: $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}=0$ in the equatorial/orbital plane, $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R}\neq 0$ generically elsewhere. In the post-Newtonian framework, this structure can actually be physically explained in

[29] From the intrinsic relative velocities proposed in [63], only one yields a symmetric notion of rest (i.e., $A$ being comoving with $B$ implies $B$ to be comoving with $A$), and is not transitive (i.e. $A$ being comoving with $B$, and $B$ being comoving with $C$, does *not* mean that $A$ comoves with $C$).

both cases using the same reasoning. This closely mirrors the situation in electromagnetism and can be traced back to the fact that $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$ is linear to 1PN order, such that a superposition principle applies (like in electromagnetism) and one can treat for these matters a spinning body as an assembly (in the spirit of [19]) of translating mass elements. We hope this may shed some light on this issue.

However, in spite of the insight it gives into the invariant structures, it is crucial to realize that the analogy between the invariants of $F_{\alpha\beta}$ and $R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$ is purely *formal*, as it relates objects that do not play analogous *physical* roles in the two theories. The effects involved are different, and may actually be opposite (Sec. VI A). Focusing on magnetism/gravitomagnetism (and taking, as probes, magnetic dipoles/gyroscopes), the invariants of $F_{\alpha\beta}$ give conditions for the existence of velocity fields for which the magnetic *field* $B^\alpha$ vanishes, i.e., for which magnetic dipoles do not undergo Larmor precession (but they feel a force in general, as the magnetic *tidal tensor* $B_{\alpha\beta}$ is non-vanishing for a particle moving in an inhomogeneous field); the invariants of $R_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta}$ give (in vacuum) conditions for the existence of velocity fields for which the gravitomagnetic tidal tensor $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$ vanishes, i.e., a gyroscope feels no force (not that it does not precess relative to the "distant stars"). Hence the use of the invariants and the electromagnetic analogy in the discussion [1, 2, 26] of gyroscope precession and the gravitomagnetic deflection of test particles (that have been under experimental and observational scrutiny) is essentially misguided, as these are effects governed by the gravitomagnetic field $H^\alpha$ (the dynamical analogue of $B^\alpha$), not the tidal tensor $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta}$. One should not confuse GEM *inertial fields* with *tidal tensors*; a pedagogical example are spacetimes with uniform $H^\alpha$, e.g. the Gödel universe (Sec. VI B 3), where there is a rigid frame where $\mathbb{E}_{\alpha\beta} \neq 0$ and $\mathbb{H}_{\alpha\beta} = 0$ everywhere, whilst $G^\alpha = 0$ and $H^\alpha \neq 0$ (i.e., it is purely electric from the point of view of the curvature, and exactly the opposite in terms of the GEM fields).

The curvature invariants are locally measurable quantities that are built on GEM tidal tensors, *not* on inertial fields, which are reference frame artifacts (that vanish in locally inertial frames), and as such cannot be directly reflected in invariants. Yet still there are special cases where one can infer about the gravitomagnetic field $\vec{H}$ from the invariants. $\vec{H}$ has a clear meaning in terms of gyroscope precession and test particle deflection relative to the distant stars if it is measured in a shear-free frame which is inertial at infinity. As discussed in Sec. VI C, in a vacuum (or electrovacuum) Petrov type D spacetime, shear-free frames where $\vec{H}$ is globally zero (i.e., shear- and vorticity-free observer congruences) exist if and only if $\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} > 0$, $\star\mathbf{R}\cdot\mathbf{R} = 0$ hold in an *open 4-D region*. Concerning the astrophysical setups of interest, this tells us that, in the Kerr spacetime (describing approximately the field of a spinning body), $\vec{H} \neq 0$ everywhere in any non-shearing frame; and that in the Schwarzschild spacetime there are shear-free frames (among them the frame adapted to the static observers, $\mathbf{u} \propto \partial/\partial t$, which is star fixed), where $\vec{H} = 0$ everywhere. Hence, in these two special cases, one can indeed imply, based on the curvature invariants, a distinction between them in terms of gravitomagnetic field $\vec{H}$/frame dragging, which, to some extent, supports the claim in [26]. But since, amongst the systems under discussion, these are the only ones of Petrov type D (it does not apply to the 2-body system, or others in general), this is all one can say, based on curvature invariants (and with the present knowledge), about $\vec{H}$.

We note (Sec. VI B 1), on the other hand, that in the post-Newtonian regime (which pertains to all the gravitomagnetic effects detected to date, and those that one hopes to detect in the near future), criteria for the vanishing or not of $\vec{H}$ *in PN frames*, based on the "scalars" $\vec{G}^2 - \vec{H}^2$ and $\vec{G}\cdot\vec{H}$, formally analogous to the electromagnetic invariants, can be devised. These quantities, however, are not field invariants, nor do they have a straightforward relation with the curvature invariants. Such analogy originates instead from the similarity between the transformation laws for the post-Newtonian GEM fields and those for the electromagnetic fields.

Concluding, curvature invariants tell us about the gravitomagnetic tidal field (magnetic curvature); they do not tell us directly (or at all, in general), about the gravitomagnetic field $H^\alpha$ and the frame-dragging effects that have been under experimental scrutiny, which are based on spin precession and orbital effects (including precession) caused by the gravitomagnetic "force" $\vec{v}\times\vec{H}$ on test particles in (approximately) *geodesic* motion. Appropriate probes to measure magnetic curvature would be the *force* on a gyroscope, or gravity gradiometers, as proposed in e.g. [70, 97].

### Acknowledgments

We thank I. Ciufolini, M. Soffel, S. Klioner and G. Anglada for the discussions that motivated this work, and E. Minguzzi for defining discussions in its early stages. We are indebted to O. Semerák for his generous and careful reading of the manuscript, and the many discussions, suggestions and remarks that decisively contributed to it. L. F. C. is funded by FCT through grant SFRH/BDP/85664/2012.

[1] I. Ciufolini, New Astron. **15**, 332 (2010).
[2] S. Kopeikin in *General Relativity and John Archibald Wheeler*, I. Ciufolini and R. A. Matzner (eds.), Astrophysics and Space Sci. Lib. **367**, pp. 337-343, Springer,

2010. [arXiv:0809.3392]
[3] K. Nordtvedt, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **27**, 2347 (1988).
[4] N. Ashby, B. Shahid-Saless, Phys. Rev. D **42**, 1118 (1990). *Idem*, NASA Tech. Memorandum 100744
[5] *Review of Gravity Probe B* (National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 1995)
[6] R. F. O' Connell, Class. Quantum Grav. **22**, 3815 (2005)
[7] I. Ciufolini, Nature **449**, 41 (2007)
[8] L. F. Costa, C. Herdeiro, in *Relativity in Fundamental Astronomy: Dynamics, Reference Frames, and Data Analysis*, S. Klioner, P. K. Seidelmann and M. Soffel (eds), Proc. IAU vol **5** S261, pp 31-39, Cambridge U. Press (2010) [arXiv:0912.2146]
[9] D. Bini, P. Carini, R. T. Jantzen, D. Wilkins, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 2820 (1994).
[10] B. Bertotti, I. Ciufolini, P. L. Bender, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 1062 (1987).
[11] I. Shapiro, R. Reasenberg, J. Chandler, R. Babcock, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 2643 (1988).
[12] J. Williams, X. Newhall, J. Dickey, Phys. Rev. D **53**, 6730 (1996).
[13] F. Everitt *et al*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 221101 (2011). `http://einstein.stanford.edu/`
[14] R. P. Breton *et al*, Science, **321**, 104 (2008).
[15] I. Stairs, S. Thorsett, Z. Arzoumanian, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 141101 (2004)
[16] K. Nordtvedt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 2647 (1988)
[17] K. Nordtvedt, Proceedings of Villa Mondragone International School of Gravitation and Cosmology, September 2002 [arXiv:gr-qc/0301024v1]
[18] M. Soffel, S. Klioner, J. Muller, L. Biskupek, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 024033 (2008).
[19] T. W. Murphy Jr., K. Nordtvedt, S. G. Turyshev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 071102 (2007).
[20] S. Kopeikin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 229001 (2007).
[21] T. W. Murphy Jr., K. Nordtvedt, S. G. Turyshev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 229002 (2007)
[22] K. Nordtvedt, Phys. Rev. D **7**, 2347 (1973).
[23] I. Ciufolini, E. Pavlis, Nature **431**, 958 (2004).
[24] I. Ciufolini, E. Pavlis, R. Peron, New Astron. **11**, 527 (2006).
[25] I. Ciufolini et al, Space Sci. Rev. **148**, 71 (2009). `http://www.lares-mission.com/`
[26] I. Ciufolini, J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation and Inertia*, Princeton Series in Physics (Princeton Univ, NJ, 1995).
[27] R. F. O'Connell, in *Atom Optics and Space Physics*, Proc. of Course CLXVIII of the International School of Physics "Enrico Fermi," Varenna, Italy, 2007, ed. E. Arimondo, W. Ertmer and W. Schleich.(Societa Italiana di Fisica, 2009)
[28] H. Pfister, Gen. Rel. Grav. **44**, 3217 (2012)
[29] J. Overduin, Class. Quant. Grav. **32**, 224003 (2015)
[30] J.-F. Pascual-Sánchez, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **13**, 2345 (2004)
[31] T. Damour, M. Soffel, C. Xu, Phys. Rev. D., **43**, 3273 (1991)
[32] J. D. Jackson, *Classical Electrodynamics*, 3rd Ed. (John Wiley & Sons, NY, 1999).
[33] L. Filipe O. Costa, Carlos A. R. Herdeiro, Phys. Rev. D. **78**, 024021 (2008)
[34] L. F Costa, J. Natário, Gen. Rel. Grav. **46**, 1792 (2014).
[35] L. F Costa, J. Natário, [arXiv:1207.0465v3].
[36] L. Bel, Cahiers de Physique, **16**,59 (1962); Eng. trans. Gen. Rel. Grav., **32**, 2047 (2000).
[37] W. B. Bonnor, Class. Quant. Grav. **12**, 499 (1995).
[38] C. B. G. McIntosh, R. Arianrhod, S. T. Wade, C. Hoenselaers, Class. Quant. Grav. **11**, 1555 (1994)
[39] C. Lozanovski and C. B. G. McIntosh, Gen. Rel. Grav. **31**, 1355 (1999).
[40] C. Cherubini, D. Bini, S. Capozziello, R. Ruffini, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **11**, 827 (2002).
[41] L. Wylleman, N. Van den Bergh, Phys. Rev. D. **74**, 084001 (2006).
[42] N. Van den Bergh, Class. Quant. Grav. **20** (2003) L1.
[43] N. Van den Bergh, Class. Quant. Grav. **20** (2003) L165
[44] B. M. Haddow, J. Math. Phys. **36**, 5848 (1995).
[45] A. Barnes, Proc. 27th Spanish Relativity Meeting, Eds. J.A. Miralles, J.A. Font and J.A. Pons, Univ. Alicante Press, pp.113-118 (2004) [arXiv:gr-qc/0401068]
[46] H. Stephani, D. Kramer, M. Maccallum, C. Hoenselaers, E. Herlt, *Exact Solutions of Einstein's Field Equations*, 2nd Ed., Cambridge Univ. Press (2003)
[47] L. Bel, Colloques Internationaux du Centre national de la reserche scientifique, p. 119, Paris (1962).
[48] V. D. Zakharov, *Gravitational Waves in Einstein's Theory*, Eng. Trans. by R. N. Sen (Halsted Press - John Wiley and Sons Inc, 1973)
[49] W. Campbell, J. Macek, T. Morgan, Phys. Rev. D **15**, 2156 (1977).
[50] W. Campbell, T. Morgan, Am. J. Phys. **44**, 356 (1976).
[51] J. M. M. Senovilla, Class. Quantum Grav. **17**, 2799 (2000).
[52] A. García-Parrado Gómez-Lobo, Class. Quant. Grav. **25**, 015006 (2008).
[53] J. J. Ferrando, J. A. Sáez, Class. Quant. Grav. **29**, 075012 (2012).
[54] J. J. Ferrando, J. A. Sáez, Class. Quant. Grav. **19**, 2437 (2002).
[55] J. Natário, Gen. Rel. Grav. **39**, 1477 (2007).
[56] H. Stephani, *Relativity, an introduction to special and general relativity*, 3rd Ed. (Cambride Univ. Press, 2004), ch. 9.
[57] M. F. A Silva, L. Herrera, F. M. Paiva, N. O. Santos, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **12**, 111 (1995)
[58] L. F. Costa, J. Natário, M. Zilhão, to appear at Phys. Rev. D [arXiv:1207.0470]
[59] R. T. Jantzen, P. Carini, D. Bini, Ann. Phys. **215**, 1 (1992).
[60] R. T. Jantzen, P. Carini, D. Bini, "GEM: the User Manual" (2004) `http://www34.homepage.villanova.edu/robert.jantzen/gem/gem_grqc.pdf`
[61] E. Massa, C. Zordan, Meccanica **10**, 27 (1975).
[62] E. Massa, Gen. Rel. Grav. **5**, 573 (1974).
[63] V. Bolós, Commun. Math. Phys. **273**, 217 (2007).
[64] V. Bolós, J. Geom. Phys. **56**, 813 (2006).
[65] W. G. Dixon, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A. **314**, 499 (1970).
[66] M. L. Ruggiero and A. Tartaglia, Il Nuovo Cimento B, **117**, 743 (2002).
[67] A. Matte, Canadian J. Math. **5**, 1 (1953).
[68] R. Maartens and B. A. Bassett, Class. Quant. Grav. **15**, 705 (1998)
[69] J. Kaplan, D. Nichols, Kip Thorne , Phys. Rev. D **80**, 124014, (2009)
[70] A. G. Polnarev, Proc. IAU **S114**, 401 (1986) [available online at SAO NASA/ADS]
[71] C. Will, K. Nordtvedt, APJ **177**, 757 (1972)
[72] L. Landau, E. Lifshitz, *The classical theory of fields*, $4^{th}$ Ed. (BH-Elsevier, 1975).

[73] F. de Felice, C. J. Clarke, *Relativity on curved manifolds*, (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1990).

[74] S. Gralla, A. I. Harte, R. M. Wald, Phys. Rev. D **81,** 104012 (2010).

[75] L. F. Costa, J. Natário, in *Equations of motion in Relativistic Gravity*, D. Puetzfeld et al. (eds), Fund. Theor. Phys. **179**, 215-258 [arXiv:1410.6443]

[76] Charles W. Misner, Kip. S. Thorne, John A. Wheeler, *Gravitation* (W. H. Freeman and Company, San Francisco, 1973).

[77] E. Poisson, C. Will, *Gravity: Newtonian, Post-Newtonian, Relativistic* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2014).

[78] C. Will, *Theory and Experiment in Gravitational Physics* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993)

[79] L. Wylleman, D. Beke, Phys. Rev. D **81,** 104038 (2010).

[80] G. F. R. Ellis, R. Maartens, M. A. H. MacCallum, *Relativistic Cosmology* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2012).

[81] W. B. Bonnor, Class. Quant. Grav. **12**, 1483 (1995).

[82] K. Gödel, Rev. Mod. Phys. **21**, 447 (1949).

[83] M. Som, A. Raychaudhuri, Proc. Roy. Soc. **A304**, 81 (1968).

[84] O. Semerák, M. Basovník, *On geometry of deformed black holes: I. Majumdar–Papapetrou binary*, submitted

[85] K. Lake, Gen. Rel. Grav. **35**, 2271 (2003).

[86] O. Semerák, Gen. Rel. Grav. **25**, 1041 (1993).

[87] R. Arianrhod, A. W-C Lun, C. B. G. McIntosh, Z. Perjés, Class. Quant. Grav. **11**, 2331 (1994)

[88] N. Dadhich, Gen. Rel. Grav. **32,** 1009 (2000).

[89] H. C. Ohanian, R. Ruffini, *Gravitation and Spacetime* (W.W. Norton, New York and London, 1994), 2nd ed.

[90] E. G. Harris, Am. J. Phys. **59**, 421 (1991).

[91] L. F. Costa, J.Natário, Am. J. Phys. (to appear), Preprint: arXiv:1511.02458

[92] C. Cattaneo, Il Nouvo Cimento **10**, 318 (1958).

[93] D. Lynden-Bell, M. Nouri-Zonoz, Rev. Mod. Physics **70**, 427 (1998).

[94] Kip S. Thorne, R. H. Price, D. A. Macdonald, *Black Holes, the Membrane Paradigm* (Yale Univ. Press, New Haven and London, 1986).

[95] O. Semerák, Il Nuovo Cim. B **110**, 973 (1995).

[96] O. Semerák, Class. Quant. Grav. **13**, 2987 (1996).

[97] V. Braginsky, A. Polnarev, J. Exp. Theor. Phys. Lett. **31**, 415 (1980); B. Mashhoon, H. Paik, C. Will, Phys. Rev. D **39**, 2825 (1989); H. Paik, Gen. Rel. Grav. **40**, 907 (2008).

[98] G. S. Hall, *Symmetries and Curvature Structure in General Relativity* (Singapore: World Scientific, 2004)

[99] C. B. G. McIntosh and R. Arianrhod Class. Quant. Grav. **7**, L213 (1990)

[100] R. Arianrhod and C. B. G. McIntosh, Class. Quant. Grav. **9**, 1969 (1992)

[101] J. Geheniau, R. Debever, *Bull. Acad. Roy. Belgique* **42**, 114 (1958)

[102] J. J. Ferrando, J. A. Morales and J. A. Sáez, Class. Quant. Grav. **18**, 4939 (2001)

[103] J. J. Ferrando and J. A. Sáez, Class. Quant. Grav. **19**, 2437 (2002)

[104] L. Wylleman, L. F. Costa and J. Natário, *Poynting vector, super-Poynting vector, and principal observers in electromagnetism and general relativity*, to appear

[105] L. Bel, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris **246**, 3015 (1958); *idem*, Annales de l' I. H. P. **17**, 37 (1961)

[106] G. S. Hall, J. Phys. A. **6**, 619 (1973)

[107] P. Szekeres, J. Math. Phys. **6**, 1387 (1965); C. H. Brans, *J. Math. Phys.* **16**, 1008 (1975)

[108] F. A. E. Pirani, Phys. Rev. **105**, 1089 (1957)

[109] M. Trümper, J. Math. Phys. **6**, 584 (1965)

[110] D. Nichols et al., Phys. Rev. D **84**, 124014 (2011).